The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XV (N. S. IX) APRIL, 1929 No. 1

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

INDIANAPOLIS, DECEMBER 27–31, 1928

The Ninth Annual Meeting of the Association was held at the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, December 27-31, 1928, in unison with the American Historical Association and other national groups devoted to the historical sciences. In the opinion of all who attended the sessions, it was the most successful assembly since the foundation of the Association in 1919. Aided by the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce through its Convention Bureau, by the newspapers of the city, and by the efficient Committees on Local Arrangements, Registration and Information, Reception, and Finance, as well as by the management of the Claypool Hotel, the programme was carried out with satisfaction to all who participated therein. The sessions were well attended by the members of the Association, some of whom had travelled from distant cities—Seattle, New Orleans, New York, Helena, Montana, and elsewhere—and by a host of friends in Indiana. Particularly noticeable in the audiences were members of the various communities of nuns from the schools and academies of the city.

The Committee on Local Arrangements to whose generous coöperation the success of the meeting is eminently due was composed of the following persons: Rt. Rev. Joseph Chartrand, D. D., Bishop of Indianapolis, honorary chairman; Rt. Rev.

Francis H. Gavisk, LL. D., Prot. Ap., V. G., chairman; John R. Welch, vice-chairman; Charles L. Barry, Dr. R. L. Bosler, Hon. M. E. Foley, Rev. Michael J. Gorman, Rev. J. E. Hammill, Ph. D., M. P. Harrington, Rev. Michael W. Lyons, William J. Mooney, Thomas D. McGee, Joseph A. McGowan, John Gilbert McNutt, Joseph A. Naughton, Rev. R. R. Noll, D. D., Humbert Pagani, P. C. Reilly, Thomas D. Sheerin, Elmer Steffen, Rev. E. J. Ritter, S. T. D., Rev. Albert Wicke, and Hon. James E. Deery, secretary.

At the headquarters in the Claypool Hotel the members of the Committee on Registration and Information were kept busy from morning until evening directing the hundreds who came to inquire about the Association or to attend the public sessions. This committee consisted of: William J. Mooney, chairman; Mrs. Thomas McGee, Mrs. Mary D. Sheerin, Mrs. Mary B. McNutt, Mrs. A. T. Rapp, Miss Celia Galvin, Miss Gertrude McHugh, Miss Agnes Cruse, Miss Mayme Murphy.

At the preliminary meeting of these committees on Thursday evening, December 27, in the Empire Room, Dr. Guilday, Secretary of the Association, addressed the members present.

It is my privilege in name of our officers and executive council to offer you our sincere thanks for your coöperation in this Ninth Annual Meeting of the Association. As we look back on the meetings held thus far, all of us who have the interest and progress of the Association at heart realize that upon the chairmen and the members of the local committees the success of the Annual Meeting to a very great extent depends. Our officers may plan well during the preceding twelve months and our speakers may give us the best fruits of their scholarship, but the meeting itself would fail were it not for the committees which you represent. The Association has been especially favored in this regard during the past nine years. The chairman of our local committees have been the following: Cleveland (1919), Dr. O'Reilly, the present Bishop of Scranton; Washington (1920), Monsignor Thomas; St. Louis (1921), Monsignor Tannrath; New Haven (1922), Bishop John J. Murray; Columbus (1923), Very Rev. John J. Murphy; Philadelphia (1924), Mr. James M. Willcox; Ann Arbor (1925), Edward J. Hickey, Sr.; Philadelphia (1926), Daniel C. O'Donoghue, Esq.; and Washington (1927), Monsignor Thomas.

On December 5th, I wrote to all the members of local committees to bespeak their interest in arousing interest in the meeting by bringing our

public sessions to the attention of their friends. This has been done with a generosity which gives us every cause for hope in the success of the assembly during the next four days. Six national groups devoted to historical study and research are meeting here at this time. We come together during these pleasant days, exchange views, discuss historical problems with all freedom and honesty, and without undue stress on what might divide us: religious creed, political partisanship, or philosophic outlook. Nowhere else can one find a better spirit of tolerance and mutual respect and esteem than in these annual meetings. The American Catholic Historical Association is the youngest group in these annual gatherings, but its vigorous devotion to the spread of historical knowledge is recognized and esteemed by all. If this Ninth Annual Meeting is a success, it will be because we have been honored by your presence on our committees and by your able coöperation with our programme. I am asked by the Executive Council to extend the thanks of the Association to Mr. Joseph O'Mahony and Mr. Humbert Pagani of the *Indiana Catholic and Record* for their generous assistance in the publicity such meetings entail. In a particular manner I offer you all my sincere thanks and assure you that what has been done in Indianapolis to ensure our success will find a permanent place in the archives of the Association waiting for the day when we shall be old enough to have our history written.

The opening session began at ten o'clock Friday morning, December 28. Owing to the illness of Monsignor Gavisk, Mr. Joseph A. McGowan, of Indianapolis, presided. The first paper—*The Paschal Question during the Pontificate of Pope St. Victor I.*, by the Very Rev. Charles M. Souvay, C. M., D. D., President of Kenrick Seminary—appears in this issue of the *Review*. Father Gerald Walsh, S. J., the second speaker, is at present in Florence, Italy, and his paper: *Cardinal Pole and the Problem of Christian Unity,* was read by Rev. Lawrence K. Patterson, S. J., of Woodstock, Md. Few subjects today have a more living interest to Catholics and Christians of all denominations than that of religious unity. Father Walsh's paper focussed attention upon the work done by this great leader of Catholic reformation in the sixteenth century to create a new religious intellectual unity upon the ruins of the old. "On the stage of European history," Father Walsh says, "Pole played a part as the last genuine incarnation of the spirit of Holy Roman Imperialism. He stood for the idea that the solidarity and stability of Europe

could only be maintained by the further application of the principles of Christianity both to national politics and to the politics of international relations. Such political idealism in the sixteenth century was doomed to fail; and failed. But, if to the historians of yesterday Pole seemed to be clinging to an absolescent materialism, many today are reminding us that the way to peace if not to progress is to be found in a new re-discovery of the past." *The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide,* the high court of jurisdiction over the Church in the United States up to 1908, was the subject of a brilliant study of Father R. Corrigan, S. J., of the University of Detroit. The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide was founded by Gregory XV in 1622. The Congregation was to enjoy an extensive jurisdiction over all non-Catholic lands and to direct and control all the activities of those laboring in the Missions. Its founding marks the final stage in a long period of development from the loosely organized systems of earlier times to the perfect subordination of all the missions to the Holy See. In the first century of its existence, the Congregation had to solve two difficult problems: it undertook to break down the Portugese *Patroado* which prevented the Holy See from dealing directly with the faithful in the colonies; and it insisted on bringing the individual missionaries who were members of Regular Orders under its immediate supervision and control.

As chairman of the luncheon conference on Friday, Dr. Guilday led the discussion on the subject of Catholic historical activities in the United States. Basing his remarks on an article from his pen in the *Official Catholic Year Book* (1928), Dr. Guilday sketched the work done during the past half-century by the thirteen Catholic historical societies which have been founded in that time, and urged the members of the Association to assist in arousing a nation-wide interest in Catholic American history. Rich fields of historical research into the part Catholicism has had in the discovery, colonization and progress of the nations of the New World remain untilled for lack of financial support and skilled workers. Among those who participated in the discussion which followed were: Rev. G. J. Garraghan, S. J., of St. Louis University; Rev. Felix Fellner, O. S. B., of St. Vincent's College;

Rev. Francis S. Betten, S. J., of Marquette University; Mr. Frank J. Rooney, managing-editor of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review;* and Rev. Dr. Hickey of Detroit Seminary.

The Annual Business Meeting took place at four o'clock, Friday afternoon, with the retiring President, Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick, in the chair. The annual report of the Secretary was then read. Dr. Guilday said, in part:

With this meeting, the American Catholic Historical Association enters upon its tenth year of service to the cause of general ecclesiastical history. Founded at Cleveland during the Christmas week of 1919, annual meetings have been held in the following cities: Washington, D. C. (1920), St. Louis (1921), New Haven (1922), Columbus, Ohio (1923), Philadelphia (1924), Ann Arbor, Mich. (1925), Philadelphia (1926), and at Washington, D. C. (1927). Our foundation meeting in 1919 was devoted exclusively to organization. In the eight formal meetings held since that time, 113 papers have been read. These papers have covered every period of Church history and have been as varied in the range of their topics as in the countries dealt with by the speakers. Over half of these papers have appeared in print, most of them in the pages of our official quarterly, the *Catholic Historical Review.* The papers of the Ann Arbor Meeting (1925) appeared in book form the following year, edited by Dr. Guilday, under the title *Church Historians.* All the papers of the Washington meeting of 1927, including the presidential address of Mr. Clarence E. Martin, entitled *The American Judiciary and Religious Liberty,* were published as the April, 1928, number of the *Catholic Historical Review.*

The founders of the Association had several purposes in mind when they decided to create this learned society. Among these purposes were the following: (1) the recognition that in English-speaking lands the great terrain of misunderstanding and controversy between Catholics and non-Catholics has ever been the field of history; (2) the desire to create one central organization for the historical activities of all Catholics, cleric and lay, in the United States; (3) the increase of knowledge in the historical past of the Church among Catholics and non-Catholics by publishing the results of the individual scholar's study; and (4) the mutual help and encouragement Catholics and non-Catholic scholars would receive from these annual gatherings where all can meet under the aegis of history and find common and mutual grounds for respect, reverence and esteem for the great Mother Church of the ages.

How successfully we have proceeded along these laudable lines the past nine years, we can leave in perfect security to our non-Catholic friends to say. All are agreed that we fill a distinct need in the learned

circles of American life. We have been guided all through these years by the foremost non-Catholic leaders in the historical schools of the country. Our own leaders, in particular the archbishops and bishops of the American Church, and a group of priests and layfolk which has grown each year, have supported us with unswerving loyalty. In every city to which we have come for our annual meetings, the clergy and laity of our faith have vied with one another to make these assemblies something more than merely passing events in their civic experience. And beyond all this uplifting coöperation, the Association has been the means of revealing to the cultured portion of our people, Catholic and non-Catholic, the wealth of historical scholarship the Church possesses in this land. This is something lasting, something permanent, in the progress of Catholicism in the New World, and no man can exaggerate its supreme value towards our national culture.

Here, at the eve of our tenth year, I have no desire to take your time with a long survey of what has been accomplished. One factor only would I stress at this moment—the generous whole-hearted and enthusiastic coöperation the officers of the Association have been given by the members of the religious orders and congregations of the American Church. A glance at the printed list of our papers since 1919 will show how truly this has been the case in our short but very active life. The Benedictines, the Franciscans, the Capuchins, and Dominicans, the Society of Jesus, the Vincentians, the Congregation of the Holy Cross from its great educational centre, the University of Notre Dame, the Augustinians and the Paulists have taken part in our programmes, as have many prominent laymen, Catholic and non-Catholic. Nor have the Sisterhoods been absent; and it is significant that in the present meeting we are to hear a discussion of the problem of teaching Church history by a nun whose contribution to the subject is considered one of the forward-looking events in recent Catholic pedagogy. To all this, I should wish to add the note that without the cordial assistance of my colleagues at the Catholic University of America, our progress in arousing a nation-wide interest in Church history would not be as far advanced as it is today. There are many national Catholic learned societies centred in the University, and as a sign of the sincere interest in our own work, you should know that as soon as the magnificent new Mullen Memorial Library was opened, the present Rector, Monsignor Ryan, set aside one of the most spacious rooms as the permanent headquarters of our Association.

Those who remember the resolution taken at our last Annual Business Meeting will not relinquish their hope that out of these permanent headquarters will one day grow the Institute of Historical Research which was projected at that time. As I said in my Report of 1927:

We need, therefore, a training-school for aspiring Catholic historical students—a training-school that will be something more than a graduate course of history lectures, dissertation-preparation, and historical research. We need a home or an institute where the student who has finished all his class-room and seminar training may come, find the proper and adequate apparatus of books and sources, come into personal contact with the best scholars in his chosen field, and above all be free from those responsibilities and distractions which ruin the prolonged leisure so necessary for scholarly thought and study. An Institute of Historical Research, situated near the Mullen Memorial Library which is to be opened at the Catholic University of America, and within such a reasonable distance of the Library of Congress, is the ideal which should occupy a dominant place in the minds of all the members of the Association. Such an Institute, properly equipped and endowed would focus the attention of Catholic and non-Catholic alike upon the preeminent place which must always be accorded to the history of Catholicism in the world. It would be the home of the Association and of its official organ, the *Catholic Historical Review*. It would be a mecca for visiting scholars from all parts of the world. It would be, to many non-Catholic scholars who despair of finding adequate answers to their problems concerning the historical past of the Church, a centre to which they might come with confidence for assistance and coöperation. No other institution would serve so quickly a national and an international need as an Institute of Historical Research in Washington, especially at a time when the importance of historical studies and their bearing upon the cause of current problems and the shaping of our national policies have come to be widely recognized.

Certainly, if anything further were needed to justify the expenditure of so much money (we asked for $500,000) on a single cultural enterprise, the experience of the past year in politico-religious tendencies would be quite sufficient.

One aspect ought to be clearer than ever before, to our people. Never has it been so vital to the peace of any nation in which Catholics and non-Catholics live side by side that our people should be well trained in a knowledge of the history of the Church. Here, in English-speaking lands, lies the main battle between truth and error, between bigotry and liberal-mindedness, between Christ and the spirit of the modern world.

The past year revealed more clearly than ever the futility of a scattering defence of our Catholic historical past. There should be, as in God's providence no doubt there will be one day, a central school or institute where all these problems which cause antagonistic attitudes in our people, can be calmly studied and evaluated by our own scholars and by the ever-increasing number of those who are devoted to historical truth, independently of all

conclusions created by such an impartial study. The Association asks for this Institute of Historical Research with the firm purpose of laying the ax to the root of all these prejudices which are the fruits of a misunderstanding or a misinterpretation of the historical background Catholicism brings to every land under the sun, to every problem in the realm of thought and of action, and to every mind desirous of promoting the culture and civilization of mankind.

The following Reports were then read:

(a) Report of the Treasurer

(Dec. 1, 1927 to Nov. 30, 1928)

Final Balance—December 1, 1927		$4,745.37
Investments:		
Federal Land Bank notes	$2,500.00	
Liberty Bond	500.00	
		3,000.00
Cash on Hand		$1,745.37
Receipts:		
Annual Dues		$2,401.85
Life Memberships		250.00
Interest on Liberty Bond and Federal Land Bank Notes		156.25
Interest on Bank Deposits		37.87
Contributions to Annual Meeting Expenses		304.00
Contributions to 1928 Membership Campaign		20.00
Total Receipts		$3,169.97
Expenditures:		
Expense of Office Supplies and Service		$ 876.13
Expense of Annual Meeting		166.91
Investment and Interest (Federal Land Bank Note)		1,038.75
Doctor Jameson (*Writings on American History*)		50.00
Catholic Historical Review		1,260.30
Total Expenditures		$3,392.09

RECAPITULATION:

CASH ON HAND (Dec. 1, 1927)		$1,745.37
TOTAL RECEIPTS		3,169.97
		$4,915.34
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		3,392.09
CASH ON HAND (Nov. 30, 1928)		$1,523.25
INVESTMENT:		
Liberty Bond	$ 500.00	
Federal Land Bank Notes	3,500.00	
		4,000.00
FINAL BALANCE (November 30, 1928)		$5,523.25

Respectfully submitted,

C. F. THOMAS,
Treasurer.

(b) REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP

(*December 8, 1928*)

This Report chronicles the membership of the Association between December 23, 1927 and December 8, 1928. The total membership on December 31, 1926, was 517, marking an advance of 142 members over the total membership of 1925. During 1927 the Association elected to its ranks 6 life members and 72 annual members. The total loss by death, resignation and delinquency in 1927 was 32. The membership on January 1, 1928, was 568. During the past year we have had one campaign for membership. Carefully selected lists of 300 students, teachers and writers of Church history were made with the result that up to December 8, we have received one application for life membership (Rt. Rev. J. H. Schlarman, D. D., of Belleville, Illinois) and annual membership as follows: Bishops, 8; Monsignori, 6; Priests, 54; Institutions, 4; Brothers, 1; Sisters, 8; Laity, 10—making a total of 91 new members for the year. We have lost eight members by death: Rt. Rev. Joseph C. Anderson, D. D., Auxiliary Bishop of Boston; Rt. Rev. John J. O'Connor, D. D., Bishop of Newark; Rt. Rev. Patrick J. Keane, Bishop of Sacramento; Rt. Rev. Michael J. Crane, D. D., Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia; Rev. John D. Command, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Rev. Daniel L. Healy, Kansas City; Rev. R. F. Moore, Bridgeport, Conn.; and Franklin S. Horn, Philadelphia. Thirteen members have resigned during the year. With

the loss of twenty-one members, our total membership on December 8, 1928 is 638, a net gain of seventy members.

I now propose for election the following new members: 1) *Life Member*—Rt. Rev. J. J. Schlarman, Ph. D., J. C. D., Belleville, Ill.; 2) *Annual Members*—a) *Bishops:* Rt. Rev. A. J. Brennan, D. D., Richmond, Va.; Rt. Rev. Edmund M. Dunne, D. D., Peoria, Ill.; Rt. Rev. George J. Finnigan, D. D., Helena, Mont.; Rt. Rev. J. A. Floersch, D. D., Louisville, Ky.; Rt. Rev. John J. Lawler, D. D., Lead, S. D.; Rt. Rev. John J. McMahon, D. D., Trenton, N. J.; Rt. Rev. Edward J. Kelly, D. D., Boise, Idaho; Rt. Rev. R. A. Gerken, D. D., Amarillo, Texas. b) *Priests:* Rev. J. V. Bacci, D. D., Mason City, Iowa; Rev. Patrick J. Barry, Ph. D., Huntington, L. I.; Rev. Peter A. Bissen, A. M., Des Moines, Iowa; Rev. Clarence W. Burkart, Loogootee, Indiana; Rev. J. J. Burke, Peoria, Illinois; Rev. F. J. Casey, Streator, Illinois; Rev. Adalbert W. Centner, Ph. D., Columbus, Ohio; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John B. Chidwick, D. D., New York City; Rev. Matthew F. Clark, S. T. L., Providence, R. I.; Rev. Joseph Bernard Code, M. A., S. T. B., Davenport, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Msgr. T. Conroy, S. T. B., Dubuque, Iowa; Rev. Edmund Corby, M. A., Lexington, Ky.; Rev. Charles A. Costello, DuBois, Pa.; Rev. Edward L. Curran, M. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Joseph J. Deppe, Pikesville, Md.; Rev. W. J. Donohue, North Tarrytown, N. Y.; Rev. Patrick F. Doyle, Ph. D., Brookfield, Mass.; Rev. H. I. Flaherty, Evansville, Ind.; Rev. Hugh J. Garvey, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Michael S. Gildea, Peru, Illinois; Rev. Eugene Hagedorn, O. F. M., A. B., Humphrey, Nebr.; Rev. Emmet Hannick, Ph. D., Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Michael W. Hyle, A. B., S. T. L., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Peter Leo Johnson, D. D., St. Francis, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Gerald Kealy, Ph. D., S. T. D., Mundelein, Ill.; Rev. Edward Kelly, Ontario, Canada; Rev. Robert Kelly, Huntington, Ind.; Rev. Robert Kelly, S. J., A. M., Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Placidus Kempf, O. S. B., St. Meinrad, Ind.; Rev. Theodore J. Koenn, C. PP. S., M. A., Collegeville, Ind.; Rev. Charles J. M. Laughlin, New Brunswick, Canada; Rev. Optatus Leoffler, O. F. M., Quincy, Ill.; Rev. M. W. Lyons, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Eugene F. J. Maier, M. A., Phoenixville, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph H. McMahon, LL. D., Ph. D., New York City; Rev. Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S. J., New York City; Rev. Leo Mutter, C. PP. S., Lockland, Ohio; Rev. William Nachtrab, Lake Worth, Florida; Rev. W. H. Nellen, St. Francis, Wis.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James F. Newcomb, J. C. D., Wheeling, W. Va.; Rev. Edmund Niess, Wendelin, Ill.; Rev. Raymond R. Noll, D. D., Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. John Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., Ph. D., Notre Dame, Ind.; Rev. Daniel E. Powder, S. J., Weston, Mass.; Rev. Edward J. Quinn, S. T. L., Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. John F. Ross, M. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. George A. Saffin, Paducah, Ky.; Rev. Charles Earl Schrader, S. J., A. M., Chicago, Ill.; Rt. Rev. Joseph F.

Smith, D. D., Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Roger C. Straub, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Joseph K. Welsh, Fall River, Mass; Rev. Thomas J. Wheeler, A. B., Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Samuel K. Wilson, S. J., Chicago, Ill.; Rev. A. F. Timmons, Rutland, Ill.; Rev. Joseph J. Sermersheim, Washington, Ind.; Rev. Omer E. Eisenman, Terre Haute, Ind.; Rev. Elmer J. Ritter, D. D., Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. J. S. Kelly, Moline, Ill. c) *Institutions:* St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton, Mass.; College of the Sacred Heart, Cincinnati, Ohio; Salvatorian Fathers, Milwaukee, Wis.; Kenrick Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo. d) *Brothers:* Brother Aloysius, Louisville, Ky. e) *Sisters:* Rev. Mother Elizabeth Dease, Assumption Academy, Philadelphia, Pa.; Madame M. Teresa Hill, Sacred Heart Convent, Detroit, Mich.; Sister M. Laetitia, C. PP. S., St. Louis, Mo.; Mother Mary Linus, A. M., Webster College, Webster Groves, Mo.; Sister M. Marcella, M. A., Villa Maria College, Erie, Pa.; Sister Francis d'Assisi, B. A., M. A., Halifax, N. S.; Sister M. Valeria, St. Francis Academy, Joliet, Ill.; Mother Catherine Warren, Academy of the Sacred Heart, St. Charles, Mo. f) *Laity:* (*Catholic and non-Catholic*) Mr. Arthur H. Brook, New York City, John Vincent Kane, A. B., Manhattan Beach, N. Y.; L. Jerome Kent, Latrobe, Pa.; John Daniel Logan, Ph. D., Litt. D., LL. D., Milwaukee, Wis.; Sylvester J. McNamara, B. A., M. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.; P. Raymond Nielson, A. B., A. M., Ph. D., Omaha, Nebr.; Dudley G. Wooten, M. A., LL. D., Notre Dame, Ind.; Miss Mary McArdle, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Grace M. Quinlan, B. A., M. A., Ph. D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Marie Clotilde Redfern, Washington, D. C.

I move that the Secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the unanimous election of these new members.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE B. STRATEMEIER, O. P.,
Chairman.

(c) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

The Committee on Nominations has the honor to present the following candidates for office in the Association for the year 1929:—*President,* Dr. Leo Francis Stock, Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.; *First Vice-President,* Dr. Francis J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.; *Second Vice-President,* Rev. Francis S. Betten, S. J., Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; *Secretary,* Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph. D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; *Asst. Secretary,* Rev. Edward J. Hickey, Ph. D., Detroit, Mich.; *Archivist,* Rev. Dr. G. B. Stratemeier, O. P., Washington, D. C.; *Treasurer,* Rt. Rev. C. F. Thomas, D. D., Washington, D. C. *For*

the Executive Council, Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Arthur T. Connolly, D. D., Boston, Mass.; Carlton J. H. Hayes, Ph. D., New York City; Dr. James J. Walsh, New York City; Thomas F. Meehan, New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES L. SOUVAY,
Chairman.

The following resolution was then voted unanimously:

The building programme authorized by Congress for the proper housing of the departments of the Government in Washington should be heartily endorsed by all citizens; The AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION invites its members to urge the speedy erection of the National Archives Building. This, one of the contemplated structures, will preserve the precious records of our national life which are at present in jeopardy of fire hazards and other dangers. It will also make these records conveniently available to research workers.

Owing to ill-health, Dr. Lawrence F. Flick, one of the founders of the Association and its first President, tendered his resignation as a member of the Executive Council. With much regret Dr. Flick's resignation was accepted.

The election of the new officers for 1929 then followed and at the close of the Annual Business Meeting, the retiring President, Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick, introduced the new President, Leo F. Stock, Ph. D., of the Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C., and Associate-Professor of American History in the Catholic University of America, who spoke to the members on the manuscript collections of the Library of Congress and on their availability for research work in the field of Catholic history.

The Secretary of the Committee on Local Arrangements, Hon. James E. Deery, entertained some twenty of the out-of-town members at a dinner Friday evening.

The second day's public sessions began on Saturday morning with a paper by the Rev. Dr. Joseph Fuhrmann, O. S. B., of Corpus Christi College, Corpus Christi, Texas, entitled *The Irish Monasteries on the Continent during the Middle Ages.* "It is

the aim of this paper," said Dr. Fuhrmann, "to show the extent of Irish activity on the continent during the Middle Ages. The paper calls attention to the Irish emigration to the European continent during the early Middle Ages which in some respects is comparable to the Irish emigration to the United States during the first half of the 19th century. It goes on to show that the great number of Irish travellers on the continent gave rise to special places of shelter—the so-called *hospitalia Scottorum*. The majority of Irishmen, however, came to the Continent as missionaries, and the paper points out the influence of certain men, especially St. Columbanus, on the monastic history of Europe. It emphasizes the fact that only a few of the many monasteries founded by Irish monks and following Irish Church discipline, were reserved exclusively for Irish monks. During the late Middle Ages, Irish monks founded the *Schottenkongregation,* which at one time numbered twelve monasteries, including some of the most important Benedictine communities in Bavaria and Austria. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, when Ireland no longer sent sufficient recruits, the Irish monasteries on the continent were taken over by native monks."

Rev. Dr. Philip J. Furlong of Cathedral College, New York City, the next speaker, gave a keen analysis of the intellectual and moral state of Europe at the end of the fifteenth century in his paper: *The Renaissance and Individualism.* The Very Rev. Alfred Barry, O. S. F. C., B. Litt. (Oxon.), the third speaker, has had a distinguished scholastic and military career before coming to the United States. His paper: *Bossuet and the Gallican Movement,* held the attention of all his listeners. Father Barry's essay dealt with the intricate problem of Bossuet's adhesion to the famous Four Articles of 1682. The question which arises in explaining the great prelate's position is mainly: To what extent and by what influence was political pressure exerted on Bossuet in his attitude? His previous record would indicate strong ultramontane tendencies. Father Barry examined the character of the man himself, the influences of his environment, and the problem of papal infallibility as seen in Bossuet's own apologetical writings. The description of the Vatican School of

Paleography, of which he is one of the few scholars with the diploma *Palaeographus ac Archivarius,* given by Rev. George B. Stratemeier, O. P., Archivist of the Association, appears in this issue of the *Review.* More than once has a member of one of the teaching communities of Sisters taken part in our annual programmes, and all who attended the Luncheon Conference on Saturday to hear Sister Mary Celeste, of St. Xavier's College, Chicago, discuss the problem of teaching American Church history in secondary schools were delighted with her presentation of this important factor in Catholic education. Her latest volume, *American History for Upper Grades and Junior High Schools,* embodies her conclusions on the subject, and the paper itself will appear in a future issue of the *Review.* Among those who took part in the discussion which followed were Monsignor Victor Day, of Helena, Mont.; Rev. Dr. Peter Leo Johnson, of St. Francis, Wis., and Father Francis S. Betten, S. J., of Marquette University.

The General Session of the Association met on Saturday afternoon, with Dr. Stock in the chair. Dr. Fitzpatrick's address appears in this issue of the *Review.*

Many of our members participated in the subscription dinner of the American Historical Association in order to hear the very entertaining address of Professor Dixon Ryan Fox, of Columbia University, on the *Disposal of Refuse Ideas.*

On Sunday evening a public meeting was held in the Knights of Columbus Auditorium, with Hon. James E. Deery as chairman. The Right Rev. James H. Ryan, D. D., Rector of the Catholic University of America, presented the speaker of the evening, Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, whose subject was *The Catholic Chapter in American History.* In opening his address, which was broadcasted, Dr. Guilday said:

> Assembled in your hospitable city during these happy days of the Christmastide, are seven groups of scholars who are devoting their talents to the progress of historical study and research in our country. For the forty-third time, the leader among these groups—the American Historical Association, is holding its annual sessions. Clustered around this—our foremost national historical society—are the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Conference of Historical Societies, the Agri-

cultural History Society, the American Oriental Society, the Bibliographical Society of America, and one of the younger groups, the American Catholic Historical Association.

The ever-increasing amount of scholarly work accomplished by the members of these societies and associations can never be adequately estimated by any one man. For the most part, the notable contributions made year after year at these annual assemblies have been given by men and women whose days are crowded with academic duties. The membership of these groups can by no stretch of the imagination be numbered among the leisured class, for in spite of great foundations and pensions funds, there is little attraction of a financial kind either to urge rising scholars to enter as teachers of history in our colleges and universities or to hold older men to a task which looks coldly upon them as the advancing years lessen their capacity for the arduous labor of the classroom.

Something more is needed to bring to the service of the historical sciences so many men and women who possess a sacred regard and affection for their vocation. Some other impulse, some other ideal, than the desire for wealth or even a generous competence, must hold them fast in their consecration to this important part of our intellectual life.

What that ideal is, is not hard to define by any one who has had the pleasure to attend these annual meetings for a number of years or who has had the special privilege of the acquaintance and friendship of so many of the scholars who constitute these national groups. Simply and honestly it can be said that the dominating motive which stirs the hearts of these men and women to devote their time and their talents, without counting the cost or the self-sacrifice, is love for the truth of our historic past.

That desire for the truth and the whole truth of humanity's origin and development through the ages has of late years embraced more and more of the multitude of aspects which tell the story of man's progress. It is now about sixteen years since one of the most influential historical teachers America has seen, James Harvey Robinson, the newly elected president of the American Historical Association, in his *New History or Essays Illustrating the Modern Historical Outlook,* issued his well-known appeal for a broader and deeper and more ample extension of the historian's attitude towards the past. Dr. Robinson wrote at that time:

"We must develop historical-mindedness upon a far more generous scale than hitherto, for this will add a still deficient element in our intellectual equipment and will promote national progress as nothing else can do."

Under his inspiration, this new renaissance in historical outlook opened everywhere the windows of the house of life. Sunlight began to pour in

and give shape and form and color to corners of human interests which had long lain in darkness. I cannot take from the precious time allotted to me the moments necessary to develop the results of the New History; it has been splendidly summed up in a volume first published in 1925 by one of the leading exponents of the Robinson school—*The New History and the Social Studies*, by Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes:—"The newer history would solve the problem of the *scope* of history by maintaining that history must take into account the sum total of human achievement . . . the newer history refuses to look upon *any phase* of human conduct as unworthy of consideration . . . the newer history is not a dream of the future, but a present and powerful reality."

There can be no doubt that this is a remarkable revolution in the gamut of historiography. No more powerful impulse has in our time come into what are called the cultural sciences. And none should rejoice more over this new method of approach to a broader knowledge of the past, this universal vision of man's activities in that past, than those whose belief in God, in the purpose of creation, in man's original fall with its consequences, and in man's final destiny, enables them to see, even as in a glass darkly, the magnificent unity of life, the stupendously intricate weave of the warp and woof of human existence, and the all-embracing divine guidance of a world which we Catholics hold and hold most firmly was created to know God, to love God, and to serve God in this life in order to be happy with Him in the world to come.

We part here, it is true, from many who are leaders in the newer school of historians; part from many to whom the light of this interpretation of life has not been vouchsafed; part from all who cannot in conscience accept our teleological view of life; but we do not part in bitterness, nor do we part in disdain,—for there is mutual respect and kindliness amongst us, as there must be among all those who are earnestly, with sincerity and honesty, searching for the truth of man's long, complex, and kaleidoscopic past.

I say that we Catholics have profited and will profit much from the broad-minded attitude which now reigns in the historical field. I might say more: that of all the religious groups in our beloved land, none will be more benefitted than those of our spiritual household. History has been the principal battleground between the Catholic Church and the descendants of those who left her fold in the sixteenth century. In English-speaking lands, one might venture the thesis that history has been the principal scene of conflict between Catholic and non-Catholic. No true American can look upon internal conflict of any kind, and particularly religious conflict, with indifference. Peace within our own borders is the highest blessing the nation can enjoy. Without peace, prosperity is empty of happiness; without peace, material and spiritual

progress is at a standstill. No nobler contribution can be made to our national advancement than to assist in strengthening the bonds of peace between all the citizens of our land—regardless of creed, color or party.

It was to bring together into one body all those who recognized in the newer history, a means towards a better understanding of Catholic contribution to world culture; it was for the purpose of spreading among Americans of all creeds an accurate appreciation of the historical past of the Catholic Church that the American Catholic Historical Association was created.

Perhaps nowhere else in the English-speaking world is such a society so necessary. Here in the United States we have inherited some of the bitterest of the legacies left by the religious situation of the sixteenth century; and it will be here in America, with its fundamental laws of life, liberty, justice, and religious equality, that most of the unfortunate misunderstandings of the past four hundred years will be clarified and solved. In very fact, American Catholics are not fully cognizant of how much has already been accomplished in this respect by historical students not of their faith.

How difficult, how almost impossible in a way, the task of bringing about a better understanding of the concord between Catholic principles and American ideals, of the social and intellectual values of Catholic doctrines in all phases of human life, in the minds of millions of our fellow-citizens of other faiths, has been clearly demonstrated during the current year of 1928.

Let us look a little more closely into the causes of this situation. Let us trace in an easy general way in our own history the points of conflict and some of the efforts at conciliation, especially since the rise of the American Republic in 1776, not for the purpose of a critical estimate of those who have opposed us in the past and whose opposition apparently is as strong as in the days of the Stuarts, but for the better purpose of outlining for ourselves the length and breadth and depth of the study of American Catholicism that remains to be made.

Dr. Guilday then analyzed the causes of the anti-Catholic movements in the United States during the past century and a half (1787-1928) and pointed out as a result of his study the salient fact that no anti-Catholic society had as yet succeeded in making itself a permanent nation-wide organization for the effective hindrance of Catholic progress. Quoting from one of his printed essays on the subject, Dr. Guilday said:

Looking backward over the hundred and fifty years of our organized

national life, there is nowhere visible on the horizon of the past any institution which has so steadfastly and so eminently advanced the best interests of the country as the Catholic Church. She alone of all religious bodies in the land came forth from the most serious of all our political crises, the Civil War, with her organization intact and her people united. In an immense country like the United States, every bond that keeps its citizens one in spirit and one in purpose must be respected by all. Political, social, economic, industrial and religious crises have swept across the broad expanse of America during the past one hundred and fifty years, and in every crisis, the question has arisen: Will the Republic endure? To have succeeded in remaining united for a century and a half is the triumphant page America has added to the history of political government. We advance into the future with hearts lifted high with hope that our union will be preserved in spite of all the problems the future may bring. The Catholic Church in the United States is in this respect our most sacred national asset. To prevent Catholicism from contributing its wisdom and its faith in America's Almighty Protector by any law or by the furtherance of any intolerance is to deprive our country of the surest guide in civilization for that constant social reform every nation needs in order to live. America can never forget God with one-fifth of its citizens holding a supernatural aim as their chief purpose in life. America can never be effectually divided so long as these millions who adore God in the same spirit, partake of the same sacramental life, and are all children of the one true God and brethren of the one Christ, remain faithful to the teaching of the great Church of the ages:—obedience in spiritual matters to Jesus Christ, the King of the Universe, and steadfast loyalty to the Republic in national and civic concerns.

The closing sessions of the meeting began at ten o'clock, Monday morning, as the old year was passing out. The first speaker, Dr. Rager, treated the *Sources of the American Declaration of Independence,* upon which he has already published a much-discussed study: *Democracy and Bellarmine.* Dr. Rager's volume was made the subject of an adverse criticism by Professor David Schaff of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, at the last meeting of the American Society of Church History. Dr. Rager answered in detail the objections to his thesis: namely, that in the final summary "the American Declaration, which is so admirable and dignified an expression of the American mind, is at the same time an accurate expression of the Catholic mind, medieval and modern." Dr. Rager's paper appeared in full in

the *Indiana Catholic and Record* for January 4, 1929, and will be reprinted in a future issue of the *Review*.

In presenting his essay on *St. Francis de Sales: Christian Humanist,* Rev. Dr. Peter Leo Johnson, of St. Francis' Seminary, St. Francis, Wis., gave his listeners an interesting study of the great Prince-Bishop of Geneva. "Sixteenth century humanism," he said, "lacked faith and science, and held its stage by force of allure or utility. Montaigne may represent its noblest expression, still his later *Essais* became a breviary for libertines. He had stood guard for all those spirits who have recoiled from the pagan renaissance, the pessimism of the religious revolt, the religious wars, and the exclusiveness of devotion as practiced by the orthodox. Operating from traditional Christian sources, St. Francis de Sales, the cultured bishop of Geneva, singularly provided a stabilizing metaphysics and discipline for life and its conduct. Francis, like every true humanist, was supremely optimistic about human nature, greatly conservative, hence respectful pillager of the past, and withal, progressive to the end that he gave his best to better his own times. Rarely has anyone so glorified human nature, so turned men rightly to estimate their beautiful faculties, and so admirably wedded these to the divine light and rule. Itinerant student, he packed away in his booklore a rich observation of life and manners of peoples. Unlike many students, he expressed in no uncertain way his profound veneration for schools and masters, which was indeed rare because lifelong. The Florimontane Academy, of which he was one of the founders in 1606, offers an opportunity for history to project the beginnings, nature, and spirit of the French Academy. Poets are noted for ingenious rhymes at the critical times when cupboards are bare, and hardly any touches in the life of Francis are more sympathetically effective than the occasions when even such poetry fell on deaf ears. His sermons are liberally salted with classical turns and allusions. Bishop Camus has crystallized the magic power of literature as recognized by Francis. Students breaking their way to new halls were the careful topic of many a letter. Books and libraries flash out in his life and letters. Sustaining his thesis for the doctorate in the Sorbonne, Frederic Ozanam

placed Francis among the founders of the French language, which fact the French Academy acknowledges in its dictionary. Pope Pius XI decreed that St. Francis de Sales be the patron of newspaper men and all Catholic writers. Francis caught the charm, spirit, and message of the ice-bound mountains, and of the placid, fertile lowlands. Nothing escaped his eye from the rustle of a leaf to the catapulting Alpine storm. But his greater interest and observation went out to humanity, and his message to men was to love God, love not self too much, serve neighbor a great deal. To Francis literature needs the purgative rite of the Bible law imposed on captive pagan women who were destined to be wives of the chosen people. He is a grand initiator. In this rôle of every true humanist he adapted a common inheritance to the needs of his day. He is the champion of the individual, and appealed to each, not on the customary grounds of final causes, majority issues, and group morality, but by pointing to the nature of personality. To do this he broke with traditional methods of preaching by speaking to the individual. He broke with the current ideas and practice which exiled devotion from the world, and said that it was a heresy to exclude the average man from heroic virtue. His *Philothea* has moulded generations of Christians. For the Religious he brought new direction in the *Treatise on the Love of God,* wherein the experimental psychology which only a saint equipped like he was can produce. He it was that rendered the director of individuals unique because of his rich cultural liberalism and saintly intelligence. Nothing is so human as a letter. He was a prodigy in this field, all life flowed before this master in the science and cultivation of the human spirit. The Visitation Order was founded by him for women called to the religious life who could not fit in with the austere régime of prevailing communities. Here was a man, not a mere humanist, who because of his noble heart, tactful, learned pen, and tireless voice, is not so much symbolized by a Savoyard equestrian statue of him with book and pen, as by the rugged road which was hewn to the statue, because it stands for the multitude which has tracked him down, followed him and clung to him. In 1911 when his remains were transferred from the old Visitation convent in Annecy to

the new one there, one hundred thousand people gathered to pay their tribute. No police were needed on this occasion. What is the miracle? It is the cultured St. Francis de Sales. May not his epitaph read truly, the ciceronian dream of Jerome notwithstanding, *Tu et Sanctus es, et Ciceronianus et Christianus.*"

The final paper of the meeting was undoubtedly one of the most significant studies ever read in our public sessions. Its author, Rev. Francis Borgia Steck, O. F. M., Ph. D., of Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois, has had a brilliant career as an historical writer in the field of American and Franciscan history. *His Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England* brought him to the attention of historical scholars in this country, and his years of collaboration with Father Zephyrin Engelhardt at Santa Barbara increased his desire to promote study and research in the history of the Franciscan Order. His *Glories of the Franciscan Order* gave him a permanent place in the ranks of the younger group of Catholic students of history, and his recent *Jolliet-Marquette Expedition of 1673* has established his reputation for scholarship. The subject of Dr. Steck's paper: *The Historic Development of the First Order of St. Francis,* was to describe the foundations made by the saint himself and their development up to the present day. St. Francis of Assisi founded three religious orders, viz., the First Order, for men, in 1209; the Second Order, for women, in 1212; and the Third Order, Secular, for men and women living in the world, in 1221. Dr. Steck's paper concerned itself with only one of these orders, namely, the First Order. Today, this order comprises three independent autonomous branches: viz., the Order of Friars Minor (O. F. M.), the Order of Minors Conventual (O. M. C.), and the Order of Minors Capuchin (O. M. Cap.). In popular parlance their members are known, respectively, as Franciscans, Conventuals, and Capuchins. After determining the specific ideal laid down by St. Francis in his Rule of 1223 and depicting the distinctive character his First Order was to have, the paper related how in pursuit of this ideal and the realization of this character families and branches arose and developed; first, from the days of St. Francis to the year 1517—second, from the year 1517 to the present day. At the

same time, it was pointed out in what relations these families and branches formerly stood and today stand to one another, from which it was seen in which of the three branches existing today the original ideal and character of the First Order is preserved. The paper concluded with a few suggestions to writers and speakers concerning the adoption of a nomenclature that, besides being historically correct, would be at the same time intelligible to such as are not so intimately acquainted with the inner history of the First Order of St. Francis.

The Executive Council of the Association has accepted the gracious invitation of the Right Reverend Rector of the Catholic University of America, Monsignor James Hugh Ryan, to hold its Tenth Annual Meeting at that institution during Christmas week of 1929.

The former Rector of the Catholic University of America, Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, was elected to the chairmanship of the Committee on Programme.

During the past ten years of its activity the Association has steadily progressed in carrying out its chosen work of creating a wider interest in the study of general Church history. Its officers are confident that the achievement thus far presages high hope for the increased fulfillment of its ideals.

GEORGE WASHINGTON AND RELIGION[1]

As members of a church and adherents to a faith which has no theological interest in the religion of George Washington, we are able to examine that religion unhampered by allegiance to traditional reminiscences. Whether Washington did, or did not, receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Established Church; whether he did, or did not, kneel in church, or in the snow at Valley Forge; whether he did, or did not, read the Bible, or compose those doubtful manuscript prayers are tiresome controversies. Had Washington been a Catholic, consideration of these traditions would have a value to our conclusions; but as he belonged to a sect which was founded upon a protest, if not a negation, of liturgical forms, these controversies may be excluded, logically, from consideration.

George Washington was born on February 11, 1732, and on April 5, a little less than two months later, was baptized in the orthodox Episcopalian manner; two god-fathers and one god-mother being recorded as standing for him. Details as to this renunciation of the world, the flesh and the devil are not entirely satisfactory, so we can offer only the timid surmise that even in the Virginia of the eighteenth century our dissenting brethren recognized that the feminine religious influence was worth twice that of the masculine.

After his baptism, George, in a religious way, disappears from view for a number of years, and when he again emerges he does so in the character of a heedless iconoclast, for he scrawls his youthful signature over the title-page of his father's copy of the Sermons of the Bishop of Exeter. In this assault upon the title, or title-page, of a dignitary of the Established Church may be found, perhaps, the germ of the cherry tree and the I-cannot-tell-a-lie fable. Perhaps the cherry tree was really this book of sermons and the pen a hatchet, in arboreal disguise.

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the American Catholic Historical Association at Indianapolis, December 29, 1928.

A man's religious ideas are peculiarly personal and to attempt an analysis of them after the man himself has passed off the stage of life is a difficult matter at best; but it does not solve the difficulty by merely presenting the laudatory opinions of his contemporaries. We cannot rest content with this in Washington's case and will try, therefore, to form an opinion by examining Washington's own self-record for: His personal record of church attendance; his estimate of the value of religious practices among the people at large; his desire and effort to encourage a recognition of God's goodness and to inculcate in the people a spirit of gratitude towards the Deity and, lastly, his own expressions of opinion respecting God.

An examination of these evidences as they develop in Washington's own writings will give a fairly balanced and accurate picture of Washington's religious attitude.

The scanty material of his youthful days is relatively unimportant and the religious record practically starts with the time when he was commanding the Virginia troops on the western frontier, after Braddock's defeat. At Fort Loudoun, Winchester, at the age of twenty-four, this Colonel of Virginia militia, on Saturday, September 18, 1756, ordered that "The men parade tomorrow morning at beating the long roll, with their arms and ammunition clean and in good order, and to be marched by the Sergeants of the respective companies to the Fort, there to remain until prayers are over." It is plain that the danger of an Indian surprise attack was a factor, as the men were sent to prayers under arms; also it is plain that Washington took it for granted that the officers would display some interest and was annoyed that they did not, for the next Saturday came a more pointed order: "The men are to parade at beating the long roll tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock; and to march as usual to the Fort to attend Divine Service. The officers are to be present at calling the roll, and see that the men do appear in the most decent manner they can." Every Sunday thereafter the men were marched to prayers and in the middle of November the Sunday service was made a standing order for the future.

We have no means of judging the effect of these rough, hard,

and brutal years upon Washington's religious views, for there is nothing of value for this purpose in the record until after his marriage with Mrs. Custis and his settling down to a normal life at Mount Vernon. We cannot state positively that Washington became a church-goer, or a more consistent church-goer, after his marriage with Mrs. Custis, but scrutiny of the records induces the opinion that she was an influence in this respect. I have checked up, as closely as possible, his record of church attendance, from the earliest available date to the end of his life, and though there are unfortunate gaps which can never be filled, some interesting results are obtainable from the eighteen years for which data has survived.

After his marriage Washington attended church at Pohick and, later, Christ Church, Alexandria, on an average of once a month. Both churches were distant from Mount Vernon so that it was something of a journey to reach them by coach and we find many entries in Washington's diaries of his being prevented from attending by the carriage being away from Mount Vernon, by his starting for church and having the carriage break down on the way (a commentary upon the state of the Virginia roads in colonial times), or of his nearly reaching Pohick, only to be met by a message that the minister was too sick to conduct the services. There are a few instances of Washington's illness and once he was held at home by the toothache.

A particularly interesting diary entry is that of May 4, 1760: "Set out for Fredk. to see my negroes that lay ill of the Small Pox. Took Church in my way to Coleman's." Most of us have forgotten that Washington rode post-haste, from Mount Vernon across the Blue Ridge, into the Shenandoah valley to see that his slaves received proper care and attention. He collected doctors, nurses, medicines, and blankets and did everything humanly possible to aid. Of course the misanthrope will say that he was only interested in saving his property and that he ran no personal risk as he was immune from the disease; but if we grant this privilege to assign motives for actions, we are entitled to the same privilege ourselves and, in this case, we prefer to think that a decent humanity was an element of weight. If material welfare, the

saving of slave property, was the main motive of this hurried journey, would it have risked an hour's delay? It seems reasonable to look upon this stop for church as a natural act of faith and trust in the Almighty.

The important point established by a close check up of Washington's church attendance is that throughout his public life, in times of political stress and strain, George Washington went to church oftener than he did in times of national calm and quiet. After the Stamp Act flurry subsided, Washington relapsed again into his once a month church attendance. On August 19, 1765, we have record of his taking the oath to conform to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England "as by Law established" and during the year 1774, when political relations with the Mother Country were becoming dangerously strained and no one in the Colonies able to foresee the outcome, he went to church twice and sometimes three times a month. It was on June 1, 1774, the day the Boston Port Bill went into effect, that he "went to church and fasted all day." A very little knowledge of the times makes it plain that the outlook was dark and gloomy for the Colonies and nowhere could they see ways and means of saving themselves from what they felt was tyranny. The political situation seemed to Washington beyond the power of man to control, but he was far from being "the bewildered giant" a recent biographer calls him; rather we incline to the opinion that Washington's more frequent attendance at church at this time shows the direct opposite of bewilderedness.

In the hectic days of the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, George Washington and religion do not appear together, so far as documentary evidence goes, beyond a statement in his letter to Martha, that he relied confidently "on that Providence which has heretofore preserved and been bountiful to me." In the manly speech with which he accepted the appointment of commander-in-chief of the army he made no reference to God or to heaven; but one month after taking command of the army the matter of prayers and church service appears in the general orders for August 5, 1775, at Cambridge. These orders directed that "the Church

be cleaned tomorrow and the Revd. Mr. Doyle will perform Divine Service therein at ten o'clock."

But it is the expedition against Canada, undertaken shortly thereafter, that first reveals the religious broadmindedness of Washington. It is difficult to see the path by which the commander-in-chief reached this attitude of mind, singular in its contrast to that of the majority of the patriots of 1775, both in the army and in the Continental Congress; but it reveals George Washington, even at this early date, as the remarkable man of the Revolution. The first article of the instructions which the commander-in-chief drew up for the guidance of Colonel Benedict Arnold reads: "You are immediately, on their march from Cambridge, to take command of the detachment of the Continental Army against Quebec and use all possible expedition as the winter season is now advancing and the Success of this Enterprise (under God) depends Wholly upon the Spirit with which it is pushed; and the favourable Disposition of the Canadians and Indians." And the 14th instruction is in these remarkable words: "As the Contempt of the Religion of a Country by ridiculing any of its Ceremonies or affronting its Ministers or Votaries has ever been deeply resented You are to be particularly careful to restrain every Officer and Soldier from such Imprudence and Folly and to punish every Instance of it. On the other hand as far as lays in your Power you are to protect and support the free Exercise of the Religion of the Country and the undisturbed Enjoyments of the Rights of Conscience in religious Matters with your utmost Influence and Authority." The letter to Arnold enclosing these instructions emphasized the point: "I also give it in charge to you to avoid all Disrespect or Contempt of the Religion of the Country and its Ceremonies. Prudence, policy and a true Christian Spirit will lead us to look with compassion upon their Errors without insulting them. While we are contending for our own Liberty, we should be very cautious of violating the Rights of Conscience in others, ever considering that God alone is the judge of the Hearts of men and to him only in this case, they are answerable." The delightful human egoism in that compassion for error

is readily forgiven and more than canceled by the rights of conscience principle that follows it.

A dominant reason for the emphatic warnings may be found in Washington's recognition of the prejudice against "popery" existing in New England in 1775, which had so valiantly assisted in ruining all chance of a Canadian alliance in the Congress of 1774. This same, blatant Protestantism, two months after Arnold's instructions were drafted, drew from Washington a blast of anger which shows that the Virginia Episcopalian was a better man, a better patriot and a better politician than the native sons of the colony that had started the rebellion. On November 5, the general orders announced that "The Commander in chief has been apprized of a design form'd for the observance of the ridiculous and childish custom of burning the Effigy of the pope. He cannot help expressing his surprise that there should be Officers and Soldiers in this army so void of common sense as not to see the impropriety of such a step at this juncture; at a time when we are solliciting and have really obtained the friendship of the people of Canada, whom we ought to consider as Brethren embarked in the same Cause: the defence of the general Liberty of America. At such a juncture and in such circumstances, to be insulting their Religion, is so monstrous, as not to be suffered or excused; indeed instead of offering the most remote insult, it is our duty to address public thanks to these our Brethren for every late happy Success over the common enemy in Canada." Needless to say Pope's Night was not celebrated in the army in 1775, nor at any time thereafter.

Just ten days later we find the announcement of the victory at St. John's, Canada, in these words: "The Commander in chief is confident the army under his immediate direction will show their gratitude to Providence for thus favoring the cause of Freedom and America by their thankfulness to God, and by their zeal and perseverance in this righteous cause, continue to deserve his future blessings." Next came the news, two weeks later, of the capture of Montreal and the orders announced that "The General hopes such frequent favours from divine Providence will animate every American to continue to exert his utmost in the defence

of the Liberties of his Country, as it would now be the basest ingratitude to the Almighty and to their Country to shew any the least backwardness in the public cause."

The naiveté of this reasoning is of value as indicative of George Washington's mental attitude towards the Supreme Being and, regardless of other conclusions, there is in it a simple, childlike faith which commands respect. Was there every a war since the Christian era when it was not claimed by both combatants that God was on their side? But George Washington has given the idea a distinctly American flavor by calling on the Continental soldier to help God.

Then comes a personal note of soul humility in his letter to Joseph Reed in January, 1776: "I have scarcely," wrote Washington, "emerged from one difficulty before I have plunged into another. How it will end, God in his great goodness will direct. I am thankful for his protection to this time." One thing that speedily became clear to the mind of George Washington was that the military and governmental difficulties of America were not, and could not, be properly met without the help of God. They were too great and America was too feeble, in Washington's judgment, to admit of their successful solution without help from on high and certainly the verdict of history as to the magnitude of these difficulties has confirmed Washington's political judgment, though the muse is still too profane to admit the accuracy of his religious belief. Also, instead of becoming opinionated, instead of developing an ego, instead of becoming confident of his abilities as he succeeded in surmounting one difficulty after another, George Washington became more and more convinced that the hand of God was in those triumphs and greater and greater became his spiritual humility, but not weak dependence on, his Creator. This humility in success and willingness to accept failure without complaint is exemplified at the end of the siege of Boston. You recall the seizure and fortification of Dorchester Heights and how the British prepared for another Bunker Hill, for they attempted to cross the bay and storm the works, and Bunker Hill would have been child's play to the slaughter that would have ensued. You recall also, that the red-coats were prevented from crossing

the water by a sudden and violent storm which lasted so long that by the time it was over Howe felt that the works had become too strong for him; gave over the attempt and evacuated the town. Here is Washington's comment to his brother John on the occurrence: "That this remarkable interposition of Providence is for some wise purpose, I have not a doubt." And this was rather an extraordinary thing to say, for with the preparations made, all contingencies provided for, and with a sufficiency of ammunition, none of which things were present at the affair of Bunker Hill, it is quite reasonable to assume that Howe's attempt would have resulted in the complete annihilation of the British army.

The setting up of the actual machinery of religion in the Continental Army has some evidence of value for our purpose. The Congress authorized the employment of chaplains, after Washington had urged it, and the general orders of July 9, 1776, when the Army was in New York City, directed that: "The Colonels or commanding officers of each regiment are directed to procure for Chaplains accordingly, persons of good character and exemplary lives. To see that all inferior officers and soldiers pay them a suitable respect and attend carefully upon religious exercises. The blessing and protection of Heaven are at all times necessary but especially so in times of public distress and danger. The General hopes and trusts, that every officer and man will endeavor so to live and act as becomes a Christian Soldier defending the dearest rights and Liberties of his country." And in the announcement, in these same orders, of the Declaration of Independence, the commander-in-chief hoped that "this important Event will serve as a fresh incentive to every officer and Soldier to act with Fidelity and Courage as knowing that now the peace and safety of his Country depends (under God) solely on the success of our arms." Here again we have the phrase "under God" which was so important an impromptu addition to Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Was Lincoln guilty of plagiarism? Or was it that the simple religious fervor of our two greatest Americans was closely akin?

In April, 1777, the Continental Army for the first time since the siege of Boston, established a permanent encampment base.

This was at Morristown, New Jersey, and among the first things attended to was the practice of regular Sunday worship for the troops. On April 12, a Saturday, it was ordered that "All the troops in Morristown except the guards, are to attend divine worship tomorrow at the second Bell; the Officers commanding the Corps, are to take special care to have their men clean and decent, and that they are to march in proper order to the place of worship." Next week, "All the troops in town (not on duty) to attend divine service tomorrow agreeable to the orders of the 12th instant." The convenience of a church building was an element in Morristown and the army paid due observance to Sunday. It may be noted, however, that only the troops in the town itself were ordered to church, for no building would have been large enough to hold the army encamped in the vicinity. When the encampment was shifted to Middlebrook the well-known order against profanity was issued on May 31. Washington characterized it as the "foolish and scandulous practice of *profane swearing*" and "As a means to abolish this and every other species of immorality Brigadiers are enjoyned to take effectual care, to have divine service duly performed in their respective brigades." At Middlebrook, also, on June 28, the orders were "That all Chaplains are to perform divine service tomorrow and on every succeeding Sunday, with their respective brigades and regiments, where the situation will possibly admit of it. And the Commanding officers of corps are to see that they attend themselves with officers of all ranks setting the example. The Commander in chief expects an exact compliance with this order, and that it be observed in the future as an invariable rule of practice. And every neglect will be considered not only as a breach of orders, but a disregard to decency, virtue and religion."

The announcement (at Peter Wentz's, Worcester Township, Pennsylvania, October 18, 1777) of the surrender of Burgoyne, concluded with the words: "Let every face brighten and every heart expand with grateful joy and praise to the supreme disposer of all Events, who has granted to us this signal success. The Chaplains of the army are to prepare short discourses, suit'd to

the joyful occasion and to deliver them to their several corps and brigades at 5 o'clock this afternoon." Perhaps Washington's information as to the events in the north was such as convinced him that only God could have gained a victory for General Horatio Gates!

After the wearing campaign of 1777, when the battle-scarred troops were on their march to Valley Forge for the winter, the commander-in-chief issued orders on December 17, for the observance of a thanksgiving day: "Tomorrow being the day set apart by the Honorable Congress for public Thanksgiving and Praise; and duty calling us devoutly to express our grateful acknowledgments to God for the manifold blessings he has granted us. The General directs that the Army remain in its present quarters and that the Chaplains perform divine service with their several corps and brigades. And earnestly exhorts all officers and soldiers whose absence is not indespensably necessary, to attend with reverence the solemnities of the day."

The suffering at Valley Forge, the terrible weather, and the activities needful to secure enough food for the troops explain, to some extent, the lack of mention of church services during that winter. Also many of the chaplains were absent from camp and there were a number of vacancies among them, as shown by the orders of May 2, 1778: "The Commander in chief directs that divine services be performed every Sunday at 11 o'clock in those brigades to which there are chaplains—those which have none to attend the places of worship nearest to them. It is expected that Officers of all Ranks will by their attendance set the example to their men. While we are zealously performing the duties of good citizens and Soldiers we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of Patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of Christian. The Signal instances of providential Goodness which we have experienced and which have now almost crowned our labours with complete success, demand from us in a peculiar manner the warmest returns of Gratitude and Piety to the Supreme Author of all Good."

The statement that the cause of independence was almost crowned with complete success on May 2, 1778, may be considered slightly optimistic; but it raises the interesting question as to what were the rumors in the army, on that day, as to aid from France, for three days later the French alliance was announced: "It having pleased the Almighty Ruler of the Universe to defend the cause of the United American States, and finally to raise up a powerful friend among the princes of the Earth, to establish our liberty and independence upon a lasting foundation; it becomes us to set apart a day for gratefully acknowledging the divine goodness and celebrating the important event which we owe to his divine interposition." An echo of this feeling is in Washington's letter to Governor Nelson, of Virginia, August 20, 1778. Writing from White Plains, New York, he said: "It is not a little pleasing, nor less wonderful to contemplate, that after two years manoeuvering and undergoing the strangest vicissitudes, that perhaps ever attended any one contest since creation, both armies are brought back to the very point they set out from and that the offending party at the beginning [the British] is now reduced to the use of the spade and pickaxe for defence. The hand of Providence has been so conspicuous in all this that he must be worse than an infidel that lacks faith, and more than wicked who has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligations." When we find touches of romance like this in Washington's writing it raises the question as to the accuracy of the prevailing concept of the man. Though the romance of this appealed to him, even as he wrote he added a little touch of humaness that brings him nearer to us, in this deprecatory gesture: "But it will be time enough for me to turn preacher when my present appointment ceases." And to this romance and humaness we can add the touch of humor which has been persistently denied to Washington, but which he had in dry measure. It is not well known that twice during the Revolutionary War the Continental Army honored Saint Patrick's Day by order of the commander-in-chief. The first time was immediately after the evacuation of Boston, when the countersign for March 17, 1776, was "Saint Patrick." And the second time was in 1780, when on March 16 the orders read: "The General

congratulates the Army on the very interesting proceedings of the Parliament of Ireland and of the Inhabitants of that Country which have been lately communicated; not only as they appear calculated to remove those heavy and tyrannical oppressions on their trade but to restore to a brave and Generous People the ancient Rights and Freedom and by their operation to promote the cause of America [2]—Desirous of impressing on the minds of the Army, transactions so important in their nature the General directs that all fatigue and working parties cease for tomorrow the 17th—a day held in particular regard by the People of that Nation. At the same time he orders this he persuades himself that the celebration of the day will not be attended by the least rioting or disorder. The Officers to be at their quarters in camp and the troops of each state line are to keep within their own encampment." The next day, March 17, the parole was "Saints" and the countersigns "Patrick" and "Shela."

Washington was well aware of the healthy recklessness of many of his stalwarts and knew the Irish liking for a good rough and tumble. There is in these orders also, a recognition of the existence of that feeling which had prompted the attempted celebration of Pope's Night in 1775, so it was wise caution that guarded against a possible Donnybrook Fair in camp.

Two more general orders should be noted. On the day after the surrender of Cornwallis, October 20, 1781, Washington's greatest military triumph of the war, he directed that "Divine Service is to be performed tomorrow in the several Brigades and Divisions. The Commander in chief earnestly recommends that the troops not on duty should universally attend with that seriousness of Deportment and gratitude of Heart which the recognition of such reiterated and astonishing interpositions of Providence demands of us."

In the midst of this overwhelming victory George Washington's mind reverted to the repeated and astonishing interposition

[2] The Irish Parliament had petitioned the Crown of Great Britain to remove certain trade restrictions and Lord North had announced, in the British Parliament, that the petition would, most likely, receive favorable consideration.

of Providence in behalf of America, though he can, by no means, be classed as a religious enthusiast. On April 19, 1783, eight years to the day from the commencement of hostilities at Lexington, General George Washington ordered a cessation of hostilities. It would have been just as easy for him to have ordered hostilities to cease on April 17, or April 18, or April 20, for that matter, but Washington, the cold, the austere, suddenly displays a sense of the poetic, in deliberately planning for this precise date. (Before the coming Bi-centenary year of Washington's birth has passed we are going to revise some of the accepted estimates of the human traits of George Washington.) And these orders for ceasing hostilities display some of those traits which have been ignored: "The Commander in chief orders the Cessation of Hostilities between the United States and the King of Great Britain to be publickly proclaimed tomorrow at the New Building and that the Proclamation which will be communicated herewith, be read tomorrow evening at the head of every regiment and corps of the army. After which the Chaplains with the several brigades will render thanks to Almighty God for all his mercies, particularly for his over-ruling the wrath of Man to his own glory and causing the rage of war to cease amongst the nations." After warning that no disorder or "licentiousness" will be tolerated he directed "An extra ration of liquor to be issued to *every* man tomorrow" and he underscored *every*, "to drink Perpetual Peace, Independence and Happiness to the United States of America." It seems that George Washington disagrees with many Americans of today as to what constitutes a real celebration.

No man knew better than Washington the frightfully thin ice over which the United States of America had skated to victory. Every weakness of the governmental and military machine had been laid bare before him at one time or another. Time after time he had seen the cause dragged back from the brink of ruin by an unexpected event, or an unforseen happening, when he was well aware that no human effort could save it. That he himself had tried his utmost did not blind his eyes to the fact that this utmost, of itself, was not sufficient. The situation has its puzzle for us. Washington was the essence of practicality; but the

instincts of his old horse-racing and fox-hunting days made him ever ready to take the sporting chance. And sporting chances he took. Long Island was one; Trenton was another, Germantown another and even Yorktown itself was largely a sporting chance. All of these chances, however, were backed by the most painstaking efforts. Yet the man declined to grant anything to the heathen god of Luck and, when the seeming impossible became a success, when the weak spot in his plan, of which he was well aware, became strong through no apparent human arrangement, George Washington's firm belief in the righteousness of human liberty, drew from him frank acknowledgment of God's aid. Many times his plans failed; but when they did he merely assumed that Providence, for some inscrutable reason, had intervened. He accepted failure with calmness and began at once to build again for success. There is no trace of superstition in Washington; his faith was too strong and simple for that and it is this simplicity that makes analysis difficult. Napoleon's cynical remark that "Heaven is on the side of the heaviest artillery" and the claim that he was the man of destiny shrink to mere flippancies in comparison with George Washington's steadfast faith in God's aid to liberty. If ever there was a man who could rightfully claim to be a man of destiny it was George Washington; but he was the last man to entertain such a thought.

There is a final group of papers among the Washington manuscripts which should be drawn upon in an effort to analyze Washington's religious ideas. Probably no President of the United States, certainly no American of any rank, ever received so many complimentary addresses as did Washington. He was scrupulous in answering them and in these answers we find much that is valuable for our purpose. We have seen Washington's mental attitude toward things religious during the colonial period; the General Orders of the Revolutionary War and the diaries give the outlines for those periods; but the replies to these addresses contain what may be considered as Washington's mature convictions, coming as they do in the last years of his life. I will not quote many. The first is the clear, succinct statement in the reply

to the General Committee of the United Baptist Churches in Virginia, in May, 1789: "I have often," he wrote, "expressed my sentiments that every man conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience. . . . If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed in the Convention, where I had the honor to preside, might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical Society, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; if I could now conceive that the general Government might ever be so administered as to render liberty of conscience insecure, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish effectual barriers against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution . . . be assured, Gentlemen, that I entertain a proper sense of your fervent supplications to God for my temporal and eternal happiness." This acknowledgment of appreciation of the value of prayer in obtaining temporal and eternal happiness is worth something in generalizing upon Washington's belief in an hereafter.

A note of interest to us is the diary entry for May 27, 1787, in Philadelphia: "Went to the Romish Church to high mass." This was old St. Mary's and Washington was then attending the sessions of the Constitutional Convention. Could there have been a little of the Greek idea here, the same that we find in St. Paul's address to the Athenians? Two years later, when President, there is the delightful entry at Pomfret, Connecticut (November 8, 1789), while touring the Eastern States: "It being contrary to law and disagreeable to the People of this State (Connecticut) to travel on the Sabbath Day—and my horses after passing through such intolerable roads, wanting rest—I stayed at Perkins' tavern (which by-the-by is not a good one) all day—and a meeting house being within few rods of the door, I attended morning and evening service and heard very lame discourses from Mr. Pond." The layman's hearty understanding and sympathy goes out to Washington in this, and the recollection of it may help us, in the future, to bear similar ills with fortitude.

A month later, in New York City, is a perfect example of the sense of duty: "November 26, Thursday: Being the day appointed for a thanksgiving I went to St. Paul's chapel though it was most inclement and stormy—but few people being at church." This was the first national Thanksgiving Day under our present Government and, as he had summoned the nation to give thanks, Washington felt that he had to brave the elements and appear in church in compliance with his own proclamation. It is difficult to disentangle Washington's strong sense of duty in this from his religious feeling; but the two things are properly interchangable in this case and it is doubtful if Washington himself could have analyzed them.

The diary entry for July 3, 1791, at York, Pennsylvania, has a bit of dry humor in it from our viewpoint: "There being no Episcopal Minister resident in the place, I went to hear morning Service performed in the Dutch reformed Church—which, being in that language not a word of which I understood I was in no danger of becoming a proselyte to its religion by the eloquence of the Preacher."

To the address of the Pennsylvania Quakers, Washington's reply was particularly plain and outspoken: "We have reason to rejoice in the prospect that the present national Government, which by the favour of Divine Providence, was formed by the common counsels and peaceably established with the common consent of the People will prove a blessing to every denomination of them. . . . The liberty enjoyed by the People of these States, of worshipping Almighty God agreeable to their consciences is not only among the choicest of their *blessings* but also of their *rights*. (Washington underscored both *blessings* and *rights*.) While men perform their social duties faithfully, they do all that Society or the State can with propriety demand or expect; and remain responsible only to their Maker for the religion or modes of faith which they may prefer to profess. Your principles and conduct are well known to me, and it is doing the people called Quakers no more than justice to say that (excepting their declining to share with others the burthen of the common defence) there is no denomination among us who are more exemplary or useful

citizens. I assure you very explicitly that in my opinion the conscientious scruples of all men should be treated with delicacy and tenderness, and it is my wish and desire that the laws may always be as extensively accommodated to them, as a due regard to the Protection and essential interests of the Nation may justify and permit."

Here is the willingness of the broadminded statesman to admit the rights of conscience in religious matters, but the practical administrator pointing out with inexorable logic that unless the government which guarantees those rights is supported, there will be neither rights nor government.

To this may be joined Washington's reply to the Ministers and Ruling Elders of the churches of the Massachusetts and New Hampshire Presbyteries: "I am persuaded you will permit me to observe that the path of true piety is so plain as to require but little political direction. To this consideration we ought to ascribe the absence of any regulation respecting religion from the Magna Charta of our country. To the guidance of the ministers of the gospel this important object is perhaps, more properly committed. It will be your care to instruct the ignorant and to reclaim the devious and in the progress of morality and science, to which our government will give every furtherance, we may confidently expect the advancement of true religion and the completion of our happiness." This from an Episcopalian to Presbyterians of the 18th century may certainly be taken as indicative of Washington's belief in the value of religion in education. In this reply he also touches upon a point made sensitive by our recent experiences with the so-called "Fundamentalists," so it is perhaps tactful to leave the idea as Washington puts it, merely remembering that he believed that science as well as religion contributes a share to human happiness.

As Catholics we are interested naturally in Washington's reply to the address made to him by our religious ancestors, in December, 1789. In that reply Washington expresses the hope "ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume," he wrote, "that your fellow citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in

the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government; or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the roman catholic religion is professed." Washington never completely mastered the personal pronouns and the tangle here should be ascribed properly to a weakness of the head rather than of the heart.

In the light of recent political events Washington's reply to the address of the Members of the New Church in Baltimore has more than a passing interest: "We have abundant reason to rejoice that in this Land the light of truth and reason has triumphed over the power of bigotry and superstition and that every person may here worship God according to the dictates of his own heart. In this enlightened age and in this land of equal liberty it is our boast that a man's religious tenets will not forfeit the protection of the law, nor deprive him of the right of attaining and holding the highest offices that are known in the United States." We seem to have slipped back a considerable distance from the point where truth and reason triumph over bigotry and superstition, and it is an interesting speculation to consider what might have been George Washington's reaction to a dominant phase of the recent national election.

You may have noted throughout these extracts a consistent uniformity of expression, such an uniformity as could only be based upon a habit of mind. There is no evidence that Washington thought like the Virginian who is credited with saying that while he was quite willing to admit there were many different ways to heaven, he was quite sure that no gentleman would choose any other than the Episcopalian way; for we may recall Washington's letter to Lafayette (1787, August 15): "I am not less ardent in my wish that you may succeed in your plan of toleration in religious matters. Being no bigot myself, I am disposed to indulge the professors of Christianity in the church with that road to Heaven, which to them shall seem most direct, plainest, easiest and least liable to exception."

As a young man Washington probably thought as little about religion as any healthy, normal youth. There are indications that his half-brother Lawrence was of a religious turn of mind

and George had a great deal of affection and admiration for Lawrence. At the age of twenty-three he counted the bullet-holes in his coat after Braddock's defeat and acknowledged, with commonsense practicality that a power higher than man had saved him; the Revolutionary War taught him lessons he was too honest to deny and, as a result, Washington's belief in God became the simple faith of a child, confirmed and strengthened by the actual, living experience of a man. Beyond this point of a firm belief in God, of belief in his absolute justice and his "interposition" in the affairs of man there is little of a tangible nature; but is not this enough? We know that Washington's concepts of truth, honor and justice were founded upon and woven into this belief in God, and we can find slight fault with George Washington's truth, honor and justice. Can we, as individuals, demand that the religion of our neighbor do more than make that neighbor an honorable man and an upright citizen? Is it worth while to insist on knowing more than this about George Washington's religion? It is plain that the two great commandments were well obeyed by him, and his reply to the address of the Hebrew Congregation of Newport, Rhode Island, in August, 1790, is one of the best: "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it, on all occasions, their effectual support. . . . May the Father of Mercies scatter light and not darkness on our paths, and make us all, in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy." The final exhortation here is good Catholic aspiration.

And now as a last quotation let me read this from the Farewell Address: "Morality is a necessary spring of popular government . . . let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar

structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Is not this satisfying? "The influence of refined education upon minds of peculiar structure" seems a fairly good description of our Haeckels and our Spencers. And Washington knew that the Haeckels and the Spencers do not influence the mass of the people to any extent and he was sure, from his own experience with men, that refined education without religion could not produce the sterling virtue of rugged and uncompromising honesty.

On his deathbed, after nearly twenty-four hours of struggle for breath, he placed the final seal of courageous manhood upon his life and went to his Maker with his brave faith unshaken: "I felt from the first," he whispered, "that the disorder would prove fatal . . . but I am not afraid to go." In these last half-dozen words lie the worth of his religion to George Washington.

JOHN C. FITZPATRICK.

THE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY UNDER POPE VICTOR I

"Nothing", says Tillemont, "contributed so much to render Victor's pontificate famous as the dispute touching the Paschal feast".[1] In most minds, indeed, the name of Pope St. Victor evokes only the Paschal controversy. Yet this controversy, of capital importance though it was both in itself and in its implications, engaged the Pontiff's attention during only one of the ten well-filled years of a busy and successful administration, of which the story should be rescued from the neglect into which it is generally left.

In what this famous Paschal controversy consisted is too well known to need rehearsing in detail: suffice it, therefore, to recall here only its main outlines. All churches were in agreement as to the solemn nature of the day, and everywhere the celebration ended the season's great fast[2] and was marked by a solemn Eucharistic meal. But whereas, according to a tradition derived, it was claimed, from St. John the Apostle, the churches of Proconsular Asia and neighboring provinces[3] kept the feast on

[1] *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, t. III, p. 45: St. Victor, Art. ii.

[2] St. Irenaeus cites the various opinions which had gained currency in Asia in regard to the duration of the fast (Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv). Unfortunately the meaning of the latter part of the sentence in this connection is not altogether free from doubt. Cf. *infra*, n. 57.

[3] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv. Proconsular Asia included among others the Sees of Ephesus, Smyrna, Hierapolis, Sardis, Eumenia and Laodicea. It is hard to state how far "the neighboring provinces" extended. One would naturally think of Cilicia, Mesopotamia and Syria, which St. Athanasius mentions as sharing in the same practice before the Council of Nicaea (*Epist. ad Afros*, 2. *P. G.*, xxvi, 1032). This statement of St. Athanasius, though, causes some difficulty, at least in regard to Mesopotamia and Cilicia, as Eusebius affirms on first hand knowledge ("we possess finally letters . . . from the bishops of Osrhoene in the same strain", i. e., holding for the Roman usage). Now the word Mesopotamia sometimes stands for the whole country between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers; whereas for several centuries that country formed two provinces, Osrhoene to the west, and Mesopotamia to the east. Athanasius' statement, therefore, could not apply to Osrhoene. It is doubtful

Nisan 14th[4] (hence the name Quartodecimans given to them), no matter on what day of the week the date fell, the other churches, on the authority of a tradition going back, they maintained, to the Apostles Peter and Paul, celebrated the feast on the Sunday following Nisan 14th. The *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to Pope Pius I a decree regulating the matter.[5] Pope Pius very likely did no more than sanctioning the practice already in existence; and it is to be hoped, for the honor of his memory, that he acted on better authority than that mentioned by the author of his notice and the forger of the letter circulated under his name.

No doubt both the Asiatics and the others had in view to commemorate the great mystery of the Christian religion — Redemption; but whilst the ones considered chiefly the events from the dogmatic point of view and hailed accordingly the day of the Savior's death as a day of deliverance,[6] the others, conformably

likewise that Cilicia, the whole of it, at any rate, followed the custom of Asia, in view of the affirmation to the contrary in the letter of Constantine quoted by Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, III, xix (*P. G.*, xx, 1077).

[4] *Nisan* is the first month of the Jewish liturgical calendar. *Exod.*, xii, 6, and parallel passages rule that the paschal lamb was to be immolated in the evening of the 14th and eaten "that night," which, as days were counted from evening to evening, was the beginning of the 15th, at the ritual paschal supper (*Exod.*, xii, 8 and par. passages).

[5] *Sub eius episcopatu frater ipsius Hermes librum scripsit in quo mandatum continetur, quod ei praecepit angelus Domini cum veniret ad eum in habitu Pastoris ut sanctum Pascha die dominica celebraretur.*

[6] It is commonly held that the Quartodecimans had chiefly, if not solely, in view in their celebration of the pasch on Nisan 14, the institution of the holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, which they believed to be the ritual paschal supper of the Jews. This interpretation of the facts is not correct: none of the ancient writers who furnish any details regarding the significance of the day mentions the holy Eucharist as the object of the day's commemoration. Theodoretus, on the contrary, states very positively of the Asiatics that παηγυρίζουσι τοῦ πάθους τὴν μνήμην. Moreover, how could they possibly claim the authority of John for the belief that the last Supper of Jesus was a ritual paschal supper? They were perfectly aware of the chronology of the fourth Gospel, dating the Last Supper on Thursday, Nisan 13, and the crucifixion on Friday, Nisan 14, "parasceve of the pasch"; and indeed, in the documents bearing on the Laodicea controversy, we find Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, quoted as denying, on the authority of the Gospels—even St. Matthew—that our Lord ate the Jewish Pasch on the eve of his death: ἀσύμφωνός τε νόμῳ ἡ νόησις αὐτῶν καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια (*Chron. Pasch.*, *P. G.*, xcii, 80).

to the more practical turn of mind of the West, regarded Christ's crucifixion as a calamity and a crime to be mourned for[7] and associated the feast with the completion of the Redeemer's work in His glorious resurrection.[8] Historians attempting to define both positions have sometimes been led to confusion by the fact that both days, of the crucifixion and of the resurrection, were equally called *dies paschae*.[9] The Asiatics observed the *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, whereas the others kept the *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*. As a consequence the former were rejoicing in the Lord whilst everywhere else their brethren were afflicting their souls.

Yet despite this divergence, harmony reigned among the Churches for more than half a century. Credit for this is commonly attributed to the conditions obtaining during the first half of the second century: the various churches, each confronted by the problem of its own existence in the face of the sword of persecution, and the necessity of self-defense against the encroachments of local heresy, lived apart from one another, with but scanty relations. Facts, however, tell another story.

Even before Christianity was preached in Rome, Proconsular Asia furnished a large quota to the foreign population of Rome. As foreigners in our American cities they flocked together: we can trace one of their settlements at the foot of the Aventine near the Circus Maximus, another near the docks of the Tiber, still another on the Vatican hill; but their most important group dwelt in the over-crowded Trastevere, in the neighborhood of the Syrian settlements. There they had the seats of their associations, their

[7] Hence the fasting until Easter morning.

[8] The observance of the Lord's death was made to depend, as to its date, on the date of Easter, and was naturally marked for the preceding Friday. However, there was in early ages one point of divergence among the non-Quartodecimans: In Rome the rule was that Good Friday should never occur before Nisan 14; this rule was ignored in Alexandria, whose custom finally prevailed.

[9] *Die paschae quo communis et quasi publica ieiunii religio est*, of Tertullian (*De Orat.*, xiv; *P. L.*, i, 1284) refers certainly to Good Friday; in another place (*Adv. Iudaeos*, x; *P. L.*, ii, 630), speaking of the day of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb, he says explicitly: *Moyses . . . adiecit pascha esse Domini, id est, passionem Christi.* The use of *Dies Paschae* to designate the day of the resurrection, is too well known, and equally ancient.

collegia, their σύνοδοι, their *stationes*, and above all their temples. In course of time we must expect to find Christians among those Asiatic emigrants. Aquila and Priscilla from Pontus[10] Epaenetus, "the first fruits of Asia in Christ"[11] were certainly but a vanguard. Direct and indirect information is not lacking that under the emperors Trajan and Hadrian many Asiatic Christians had come to seek a home in the capital of the empire.[12] Nor were they always the cream of the Christian fold. Rome seems to have been the mecca of heresiarchs of every ilk; and it is well known that Asia produced a plentiful crop of them; these naturally in the Eternal City cast their nets first among their Christian fellow-countrymen whom they met in their own religious assemblies,[13] their *national Churches*, we might say. So far as we know, these churches had at their head no permanent clergy; but when priests from Asia came to Rome, they naturally attended the Christian meetings and officiated there. That this was no rare occurrence at the time of the paschal season, a well-known passage of St. Irenaeus is authority.[14] The fact happened during the pontificate of every pope from Xystus to Anicetus, that is, from 116 to 166. These ecclesiastical visitors, Irenaeus tells us,

[10] They had lived some time in Rome before St. Paul made their acquaintance at Corinth, *Act.*, xviii, 2; later on we find them at Ephesus, *Act.*, xviii, 26; and later again back to Rome, *Rom.*, xvi, 2.

[11] *Rom.*, xvi, 5. This is not the place to go into the criticism of this chapter.

[12] We do not speak of those who came to Rome for a short visit, as, for inst., St. Polycarp; but of Asiatics who had settled in the Eternal City.

[13] Hermas apparently knew some of them (*Sim.*, VIII, vi, 5); of the Asiatics the most famous was Marcion, who came to Rome about the time of Pope Hyginus (137-140); a little later came Mare and others.

[14] In Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 15 n. 15. In this passage the verb τηρεῖν stands as a technical term for "to observe the 14th of Nisan". We must disagree, though, with the interpretation given by George La Piana (*Harvard Theolog. Review*, July 1925, p. 215), to Irenaeus' expressions τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο, and τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν. They can only refer to Asiatic priests happening to be in Rome at the time, if there is any sense to the clause ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτούς. I fail to see anything "obviously absurd" in the supposition that every pontiff from Xystus to Anicetus saw one time or another such casual visitors in Rome. But when such visits occurred, the contrast of the two observances in the same city was made at once quite striking.

while in Rome, celebrated the Pasch in Asiatic fashion, that is, on the 14th of Nisan. This difference of observance on the part of a group which, after all, was proportionally small, must have, whenever it occurred, caused bewilderment among the other groups of Roman Christians. It did.[15] And yet, although the Church authorities frowned upon the Asiatic usage,[16] still they tolerated it in the Asiatic churches of Rome, and as a token of the unity maintained with these churches, they regularly sent them the Eucharist.[17]

[15] Καίτοι μᾶλλον ἐναντίον ἦν τὸ τηρεῖν τοῖς μὴ τηροῦσιν. Iren. in Eus., *loc. cit.* La Piana's rendering: "But to observe [it] was more in contrast with those who did not observe [it]" (*Harvard Theol. Review*, *l. c.*) lacks clearness, to say the least. The same writer was more happy when he paraphrased: "The different observance in the same place made the contrast more striking". Ἐναντίον here means visible; and the καίτοι connects intimately this sentence with the preceding, in which the emphasis is on the verb εἰρήνευον: "Nevertheless they, who did not observe themselves the Asiatic usage, lived peaceably with those from the communities where it was observed, when they came to them (i. e., to Rome), even though those who did not follow that usage were then (i. e., when such occasions occurred) feeling more strongly their opposition to it.

[16] Οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς σὺ (Victor) νῦν ἀφηγῇ, Ἀνίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πίον, Ὑγῖνόν τε καὶ Τελεσφόρον καὶ Ξύστον, οὔτε αὐτοὶ ἐτήρησαν, οὔτε τοῖς μετ' αὐτῶν ἐπέτρεπον. Iren. in Eus., *l. c.* The last sentence is understood by some: "nor imposed on those with them (to follow the Quartodeciman usage)". We think this is a misrendering, and prefer unhesitatingly the meaning 'to permit, suffer,' for ἐπιτρέπειν. Against this translation La Piana urges that "it would mean that the Roman bishops did not allow any Christian in Rome to follow the Asiatic custom". This objection is founded on too wide an extension given to the words τοῖς μετ' αὐτῶν, which obviously refer not to all the Christians living in Rome, but to those who took their discipline and customs from the Bishop, in contradistinction to τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτούς, the Asiatic Christians who happened to be in Rome.

[17] Αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες οἱ πρὸ σοῦ πρεσβύτεροι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν ἔπεμπον εὐχαριστίαν. Iren. in Eus., *H. E.*, *l. c.* McGiffert (*The Apostles' Creed*, New York, 1905, p. 244, n. 29) finds it "difficult to understand why Irenaeus should speak of sending the Eucharist to persons who observed the fourteenth, instead of merely mentioning the fact that the Roman Church communed with them". He evidently failed to see the strong antithesis which gives so must force to the argument of Irenaeus. Not only were the Quartodecimans coming to Rome not excommunicated (that is the sense of ἀποβάλλειν in ecclesiastical language), but, quite the extreme opposite, the Eucharist, the sacramental sign of unity, was sent to them.

Here a little digression may not be out of order. The practice of sending the Eucharist, to which Irenaeus refers, corresponds in every point with the Roman use, richly attested in the fourth century, of sending from the Papal Mass the *fermentum* to the priests of the various *tituli*, throughout the city,[18] *ut se a nostra communione separatos non iudicent*, says Innocent I.[19] If so, we have, in this apparently indifferent text of Irenaeus the assertion, on the part of one who was well informed, that the rite of the *fermentum* was already practised during the first half of the second century.[20] This, to be true, contradicts the assertion of the *Liber Pontificalis* which attributes the institution to Pope Melchiades (311-314);[21] but it may well be that Melchiades either simply revived, or regulated an old custom.

Revenons à nos moutons. In 154 Anicetus ascended the chair of Peter. Shortly after his accession[22] St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome. Cogent reasons must have motivated this journey undertaken by a man well over eighty years of age.[23] What these reasons were, however, neither Eusebius, who mentions several times this visit, nor Irenaeus states. But St. Jerome vouchsafes the information that Polycarp *propter quasdam super*

[18] Innocent I says positively that the *fermentum* is not to be sent outside the city (P. L., xx, 556-557); and even though he does not state it, the restriction must have been traditional.

[19] *Lib. Pont.*, Ed. Duchesne, t. I, p. 169.

[20] The same conclusion might be inferred, at least in regard to some time before the pontificate of Victor, from the notice devoted to him by the *Liber Pontificalis*, where we read that *fecit sequentes cleros*, to be clearly understood as referring to acolytes. It was the duty of the acolytes to carry the *fermentum* to the *tituli;* and there is no intimation that the institution of the acolytes was an innovation of Victor.

[21] *Hic fecit ut oblationes consecratae per ecclesias ex consecratu episcopi dirigerentur, quod declaratur fermentum* (*Lib. Pont. l. c.*).

[22] Eus. *Chron.* (*P. G.*, xix, 559). There is some uncertainty in regard to the date of Anicetus' accession; but this event can scarcely be placed before 154. As, on the other hand, Polycarp suffered martyrdom on February 23, 155, his visit to Rome must have taken place in 154.

[23] In his interrogatory before he suffered death, Polycarp states that "he had served Christ for now eighty-six years"; he was, therefore, at least eighty-six years old in 155. See on this point *Martyr. Polycarpi*, ix, 3, Edit. Funk (*Patrum Apost. Opera*, Vol. I, p. 292, n. 3).

die Paschae quaestiones . . . Romam venit.[24] Possibly, though, this is a mere guess on the part of the learned Doctor, the unconscious victim in this instance of the paralogism *cum hoc, ergo propter hoc.* Whatever this may be, a new twist has been given recently to the motive assigned by St. Jerome: Anicetus, we are told, endeavored to induce the Asiatics of Rome to abandon their Quartodeciman peculiarity; they refused and appealed for support in the maintenance of their custom to the churches of their mother country: to defend their claim against Anicetus' pretensions to impose uniformity the Bishop of Smyrna came to Rome.[25] This, however, is mere hypothesis, which no texts actually warrant. What motives prompted Polycarp's journey? We do not know.

But we do know that among the questions debated between the two bishops, that concerning the Asiatic usage came up for discussion. What brought it up? Again we do not know. Still there are reasons to suppose that Polycarp's sojourn in the imperial city was somewhat protracted, for "he brought back to the Church of God many Marcionite and Valentinian heretics".[26] In view of this, would it be unlikely that the occasion for the exchange of views about the Pasch was afforded naturally by the recurrence of the feast during Polycarp's stay in Rome? I say advisedly: "exchange of views", rather than controversy. True, Irenaeus notes that Polycarp could not be prevailed upon by Anicetus to relinquish the practice which he had always followed with John, the Lord's disciple, and the other Apostles in whose familiarity he had lived, any more than Anicetus could be persuaded by Polycarp to abandon the tradition handed down by his predecessors:[27] but at the same time he emphasizes the fact that

[24] *De Viris Ill.*, xvii, *P. L.*, xxiii, 655.

[25] La Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century", *Harvard Theolog. Review*, July 1925, p. 214.

[26] Eus., *H. E.*, IV, xiv, 5; *Chron.*, *P. G.*, xix, 559.

[27] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 16. Mourret goes far beyond the most wide interpretation of the text allowable, when he pretends that "le vénérable évêque de Smyrne, Polycarpe, *avait essayé* en vain de faire prévaloir *dans l'Eglise universelle* (italics mine) l'usage quartodéciman." *Hist. Gén. de l'Eglise*, Vol. I, *Les Origines Chrétiennes*, p. 265.

the exchange of views was in no way carried out in a contentious spirit.[28] Neither this, nor any of the topics which they discussed created between them the least shadow of unfriendliness. Not only was the communion between them maintained, but, as a mark of deference, *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ.*[29] This sentence puzzles not a little Irenaeus' commentators.[30] What does it exactly mean? After much consideration, the only one which seems admissible is that Anicetus sent the *fermentum* to Polycarp, as his predecessors had done to the Asiatic Bishops who formerly happened to come to the city.

At a time when many sects, Valentinians, Cerdonites, Marcionites, Carpocratians, etc., were pullulating in Rome and setting up their dissenting conventicles, when, therefore, the need of a closer union against these disintegrating forces was more keenly realized,

[28] *Μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες εἰς ἑαυτούς.* Eus., *l. c.* La Piana's rendering: "They did not come to a breach" (*l. c.*) does not do full justice to the verb *φιλεριστεῖν.*

[29] Iren. in Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 17.

[30] Valois advocated the meaning: *Anicetus in ecclesia consecrandi munus Polycarpo honoris causa concessit,* and defended it against the interpretation of Francis Florent, who claimed *Anicetum porrexisse dumtaxat Eucharistiam Polycarpo, non autem concessisse illi ius sacra mysteria celebrandi* (*P. G.*, xx, 507-508, n. 89). Most writers side with Valois. Yet the meaning: "to step aside out of the way in favor of another" (out of respect, etc.), can be given here to *παραχωρεῖν* only at the price of taxing Irenaeus of a solecism: for Greek usage in this instance demands that the thing referred to be put in the genitive case. Used transitively with its object in the accusative case, *παραχωρεῖν* seems to signify only "to concede, to grant," with a connotation (prep. *παρά*) of "from one, from beside one"; and thus we reach not the idea which seems to have been in Florent's mind, that Anicetus in the liturgy performed by himself, gave communion to Polycarp, but rather once more that Anicetus sent to Polycarp the *fermentum.* The 19th canon of Arles (314), *De peregrinis episcopis qui in urbem solent venire, placuit eis locum dare ut offerant,* even in the hypothesis that it merely sanctions an existing custom, rather than it introduces a new discipline, does not, as Valois contends, militate for the interpretation which he advocates. That canon does not say that the Bishop should yield his place, in the celebration of the Liturgy, to a visiting prelate, but that he should provide for the visiting prelate a place where the latter may officiate. This meets perfectly the conditions existing in Rome at the time of Anicetus: there was the Asiatic church, where Polycarp could celebrate the Eucharist among his fellow-countrymen; and to him Anicetus sent the *fermentum,* as it was sent to all other churches where the liturgy could be held.

it were surprising that the peculiarity of observance of the Asiatics next door should not jar upon the nerves of the Roman authorities, and that some did not entertain forebodings, for singularity is a breeder of secessions. Yet outwardly things remained very much in the *statu quo ante*: and there is not a shred of evidence that Anicetus did, in his conversations with Polycarp, look beyond the uniformity desirable in the Church of the eternal City.[31]

That forebodings, if any were entertained, were not ill-founded, the events manifested a few years later.[32] Towards the end of the pontificate of Eleutherus,[33] two Roman priests, Florinus and Blastus, the one certainly, and the other probably of Asiatic origin,[34] yielded to the wiles of Valentinianism and Montanism and were degraded from the priesthood. Both became ardent preachers of the novel Eastern doctrines and succeeded in luring away from the Church a large number of followers.[35] Not unlikely

[31] Historians, especially those who hold that the main cause for Polycarp's journey to Rome was the paschal question, assume that Anicetus had some way attempted to bring the Churches of Asia to conform. This is an absolutely gratuitous assumption, in no way warranted by the texts which have come down to us.

[32] The so-called Laodicea controversy (167) is besides the scope of this paper, as, so far as can be known from the scanty information in our possession, it was a difference between the Quartodecimans themselves. Eusebius, while quoting a sentence of Melito concerning this "investigation" (ζήτησις πολλή), which was the occasion of the Bishop of Sardis writing his work Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα (*H. E.*, IV, xxvi, 3), yet does not state the precise point at issue. However, from two passages of another work on the pasch written at the same time by Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, quoted in the *Chronicon Paschale* (*P. G.*, xcii, 80), we gather that, contrary to the common Asiatic custom of celebrating the pasch on Nisan 14, day of the Lord's death, some, leaning on their interpretation of St. Matthew, held that Christ ate the pasch on the evening of Nisan 14, and died on the next day, Nisan 15. There is no evidence, however, that these dissenters were either Judaizers or even slightly tainted with Judaizing tendencies.

[33] The place given to Florinus and Blastus by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History indicates that these two men taught their errors in the closing years of the pontificate of Eleutherus (175-189). On what grounds Duchesne *Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, p. 291, and La Piana (*op. cit.*, pp. 218, 234) regard the schism of Blastus as an aftermath of the action of Pope Victor, neither indicates.

[34] Pacianus calls him "*Graecus*," *P. L.*, xiii, 1053.

[35] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xv.

most of their proselytes were from among their fellow-countrymen, although our texts intimate they beguiled many others; and before long a new chapel was set up against the Church of Eleutherus, with Blastus for its pontiff. At once Irenaeus was on the breach, and in an open letter Πρὸς Βλάστον περὶ σχίσματος did justice to the pretensions of the rebellious priest.[36] From the almost contemporary *Adversus omnes Haereses*,[37] we learn that Blastus, besides Montanism, *latenter iudaismum vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem Moysi, XIV. mensis.*[38]

It will be noticed that, in the letter in which Irenaeus reminds Pope Victor of the tolerant policy of his predecessor towards the τηροῦντες, the name of Eleutherus is omitted. We should not wonder: for that traditional tolerance could no longer be maintained with the τηροῦντες who formed the schismatic party of Blastus.

Here was, therefore, the situation in Rome as bequeathed to Pope Victor by Eleutherus. An aggressive schismatic sect trumpeted forth in its manifesto, and made capital of the necessity of following the Asiatic usage: not only *quieta movebat*, but it had already dragged a considerable number away from the obedience to the lawful Bishop, was sewing doubt into the minds of the rest, and threatened to do more mischief. Pope Victor gauged the situation exactly. He was an African, that is, a Latin, with the Latin turn of mind for law, administration and order, and a natural aversion for the hair-splitting and the mischief-laden dilatory compromises which are the pride of the eastern intellect. The issue was not of his own choosing; and since the schismatics

[36] *Ibid.*, V, xx. Nothing remains of this letter of St. Irenaeus, save perhaps a fragment discovered (?) by Pfaff, and published by Massuet as an Appendix to his *S. Irenaei Opera* (t. II, p. 35). About the authenticity of this fragment, as well as of others brought out by Pfaff, *adhuc sub iudice lis est* (Cf. Harnack: "Die Pfaffschen Irenäusfragmente als Fälschungen Pfaffs nachgewiesen", in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1900, 2nd Series, Vol. I, part 3, pp. 1-69; P. Batiffol: "Le cas de Pfaff d'après des pièces nouvelles", in *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique*, 1901, pp. 189-200).

[37] Printed as an Appendix to Tertullian's *De Praescriptione.*

[38] *P. L.*, ii, 27; *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.*, Vol. xxxvii, p. 225.

made the date of the paschal celebration the badge of rebellion, he must accept the challenge and make the date of the paschal celebration the standard of unity. Neither did he fail to realize all the implications of that issue. True, directly and immediately this was a local problem; but its solution would be immensely facilitated if he could secure the coöperation of Asia, the mother of Quartodeciman observance, thereby taking the prop from under the recreant Quartodecimans at home. How could he, indeed, forbid in Rome—as forbid he must if unity is to be maintained—that which was lawful in Asia? That the Asiatics were fondly clinging to their tradition was a fact of public notoriety; but no dogma of faith was here at stake; the matter was merely one of discipline and liturgical uniformity. He must plead with them to abandon their local custom, no matter how dearly they cherished it. And in order that his plea might be more forceful, he would inquire from all the bishops of the Empire what they thought of this custom. No doubt that, when the Asiatics would realize they were the only ones of their opinion, and understand their tradition was no true tradition, but founded on ignorance and misinterpretation,[39] they would conform to the common usage. Through no fault of his, but by the sheer force of circumstances, the paschal question, at first merely a local question, was becoming a Church-wide problem.

Victor's letters to the various provinces are long since lost;[40]

[39] Such is the opinion of St. Irenaeus (in Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 13) who, being an Asiatic by birth and education, must have known. It was shared by others, among whom the author of the *Philosophumena* (VIII, xviii: *P. G.*, xvi, 3366).

[40] The documents available positively vouch only for one letter written by Victor, namely, that to the Province of Asia (Polycrates in Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 8), in which, we are told by the Bishop of Smyrna, Victor requested that a meeting of the bishops of the Province be held. The fact that like meetings took place in a number of provinces, and that their decisions were sent to Rome, is an unimpeachable argument that the Bishop of Rome did write touching the matter at issue to these various provinces. Another letter of Victor, addressed to Theophilus, Bishop of Caesarea, is given by Mansi (*Coll. Ampl. Concil.*, I, 698) and Migne (*P. G.*, v, 1488-1490): it is certainly apocryphal. St. Jerome dates in 196 the letters of Victor (*P. L.*, xxvii, 635); but as he assigns the beginning of his pontificate to the year

probably they were no longer extant in Eusebius' time: otherwise he would likely have quoted from them. They must have recommended a meeting of the bishops of the various provinces to discuss the matter: so much is explicitly stated in regard to Asia in the reply addressed to Rome;[41] and we know that bishops' meetings were held, all about the same time and touching this same topic in several provinces. From a transparent allusion of Polycrates in his answer: "Threats do not frighten me",[42] it is clear that Victor's letter to Asia hinted more or less openly at some drastic measures.

As has just been stated, synods were held, as requested, throughout the empire, the Bishop of Rome giving himself the example and assembling the Italian bishops.[43] Letters embodying the decisions reached in these synods were still extant in Eusebius' time, and he records those emanating from Rome, Alexandria,[44] Pontus, Gaul, Osrhoene and from Bacchylus, Bishop of Corinth "and many others".[45] With evident complacency he dilates upon

194, whereas modern historians are in favor of a somewhat earlier date, the whole scheme of St. Jerome's chronology of Pope Victor may have to be shifted backward two or three years.

[41] Οὗς (the bishops of Asia) *ὑμεῖς ἠξιώσατε μετακληθῆναι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ μετακαλέσαμην* (Polycrates in Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 8).

[42] Οὐ *πτύρομαι ἐπὶ τοῖς καταπλησσομένοις* (Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 7).

[43] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiii, 2, 3. Information not altogether reliable had it that thirteen Italian Bishops assembled around Victor (Labbe, *Coll. Ampl.*, I, p. 600). The origin of the Italian bishoprics is very obscure. Duchesne (*Histoire Ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, pp. 253 ff., and 524-526) and Savio (*"Alcune considerazioni sulla prima diffusione del Cristianesimo in Italia"*, in *Revista di Scienze storiche*, 1914, pp. 108 ff.) held that during the first one hundred years or more of the history of the Church, the Christian communities of Italy were not under bishops, but were governed from Rome. F. Lanzoni (*Le Origini delle Diocesi antiche d'Italia*, Rome, 1923, pp. 595 ff.) establishes that this was true no longer at the end of the second century. According to the *Liber Pontificalis*, Theophilus of Caesarea (the text bears: "of Alexandria", an evident mistake, since Theophilus of Alexandria governed that Church two hundred years after Victor's pontificate—he dïed in 403), attended that Roman synod: a doubtful assertion.

[44] The synodal letter of Alexandria is not recorded among the others in *H. E.*, V, xxiii, 3; but it is explicitly mentioned in xxv (*παρ' ἡμῶν γὰρ τὰ γράμματα κομίζεται αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡμῖν παρ' αὐτῶν*).

[45] Καὶ *πλείστων ὅσων ἄλλων* (*H. E.*, V, xxiii, 4).

the synod held in his own episcopal city of Caesarea,[46] and the letter sent by the bishops assembled. St. Jerome, who styles this letter *valde utilem*,[47] attributes its composition mainly to Theophilus, Bishop of Caesarea, and on its account adjudged him worthy of an honorable mention in his *De Viris Illustribus*.[48] A passage of this letter deserves especial notice for the light it throws upon the mutual relations of the Churches, "Do try to send abroad to every province a copy of this our letter". From this we understand, too, how it happened that the archives of the Church of Caesarea were so rich in documents emanating from the four quarters of Christendom. Of all these synodal letters the trend was uniformly that the bishops assembled were unanimously of opinion, and decreed that "the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should be celebrated on no other day than on Sunday, and only on that day should the fast cease".[49]

To this remarkable unison there was, however, one discordant note; as may be expected, it sounded from Asia. If Victor had hoped for an assent to his views from the Asiatic bishops, his

[46] Theophilus of Caesarea and Narcissus of Jerusalem presided (*H. E.*, V, xxiii, 3). If we believe the *Libellus Synodicus*, twelve bishops were present (Labbe, *op. cit.*, I, 600-601). The fragment of the acts of this Council printed among the works of St. Bede after his treatise *De Aequinoctio Vernali* (*P. L.*, xc, 607-610), is a ludicrous piece of forgery.

[47] *Cum ceteris episcopis synodicam valde utilem composuit epistolam. De Viris Ill.*, xliii; *P. L.*, xxiii, 657.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] The *Chronicon Ecclesiasticon* of Bar Hebraeus makes mention of a Palestinian Council held at Jerusalem in the same circumstances and for the same purpose: *Post Maximum Serapion annis viginti duo. Eo tempore, Hierosolymis convenerunt episcopi [ob controversiam] circa Pascha. Scripserunt Asianae ditioni ut illud die dominica post Pascha Iudaeorum agerent quemadmodum Romae, Alexandriae et in Palaestina fiebat. At Polycarpus ceterique episcopi Asiani illis minime acquiescentes eadem die quo Iudaei pascha usque ad concilium Nicaenum celebrare perrexerunt.* Edit. Lamy, Louvain, 1872, I, pp. 45-46. The mistake about the name of Polycrates is glaring and is found already in Sozomen, VII, xviii (*P. G.*, lxvii, 1473). The editor of the *Chronicon* appended the following note to the above text; *Concilium aliquod Hierosolymitanum in celebri ista controversia a Narcisso et episcopis decem celebratum anno* 198 *inter fontes historicos mihi compertos nonnisi unicus, nempe libellus Synodicus commemorat, apud Harduinum,* Conc. *t. V, col.* 1493.

optimistic anticipations met with a keen disappointment. These bishops had been summoned by Polycrates, Bishop of Smyrna, and he it was who penned the reply addressed to the Roman letter. His answer, of which Eusebius quotes large excerpts, refuted point by point, as may be seen from its wording, the arguments adduced by Victor in favor of the common observance:

We it is who are scrupulously observing the day, neither adding nor detracting anything. Moreover, it is in Asia that are buried the great foundation stones[50] which will rise again on the day of the Lord's *parousia,* when he shall come gloriously from heaven to gather all the saints: I mean, Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, who is buried at Hierapolis, with his two daughters who grew unto old age in the state of virginity, and his other daughter who spent her life in the Holy Ghost and has her last resting place at Ephesus; I mean also John, who leaned upon the Lord's breast, and became pontiff wearing the πέταλον,[51] and martyr and doctor: he, too, is buried in Ephesus; again Polycarp, who was Bishop and martyr in Smyrna; then Thraseas of Eumenia likewise Bishop and martyr, who is buried in Smyrna. Need I speak of Sagaris, bishop and martyr, who is buried in Laodicea; of the blessed Papyrius, of Melito the eunuch, who lived wholly in the Holy Ghost and is laid in Sardis waiting for the visit from heaven, in which he shall rise from the dead? All these observed the pasch on the fourteenth of the month according to the Gospel, without deviating from, but following the rule of faith.

As for myself, Polycrates, the humblest among you, I do likewise according to the tradition of my relatives, in the footsteps of some of whom I follow (for seven of my relatives were bishops, and I am the eighth in the family); my family has always observed the day when the people abstain from leaven. I forsooth, brethren, have lived sixty-five years in the Lord, have been in relation with brethren from all over the world and have gone carefully through all the sacred Scriptures: threats do not frighten me; for greater ones than I have said: God must be obeyed rather than men.

I might mention the bishops here present whom, at your bidding, I have called together: did I write their names, they would make a long list.

---

[50] Μέγαλα στοιχεῖα. Στοιχεῖον is literally one of a row. The expression is, therefore, equivalent to "the great ones".

[51] In the Greek Old Testament the πέταλον is the golden plate worn by Aaron and the Jewish high-priest (*Exod.*, xxviii, 32; xxix, 6; *Lev.*, viii, 9). Polycrates did not mean to intimate that John was a Jewish high-priest; but simply that he had the New Testament priestly dignity.

These, on coming to see my insignificant person, have approved my letter, for they know that I do not in vain wear gray hair, but in all things conduct myself in the Lord.[52]

Pope Victor was a Latin, with the Latin notion of law, order and authority. It is not hard to surmise the reaction of such a type of man to the point-blank refusal to conform received from Asia. But we are not left to surmises: the text of Eusebius speaks in no uncertain terms, which the use of the historical present renders yet more dramatic and forceful: "Whereupon the ruler of the Roman Church, Victor, attempts at once (ἀθρόως) to cut off from the communion the communities of all Asia and the neighboring churches, just as if they had fallen into heresy; and he fulminates a sentence (στηλιτεύει), namely (γε) proclaiming by letters all the brethren over there excommunicated".[53]

How from these most clear words can some historians, perhaps with more zeal for the spotlessness of a pope's escutcheon than for the artless candor of truth, extract with a sleight of hand the conclusion that "the pope threatened excommunication against those who followed the Asiatic practice, but the Bishops of Gaul, especially St. Irenaeus prevented a rupture"?[54] Eusebius' statement that Victor "attempted" to excommunicate the Asiatics can in no possible way be understood of a mere intention on his part, in view of the historian's positive affirmation that the sentence of excommunication was actually fulminated. Nor did this sentence aim only at cutting off the dissenting Churches from the communion of the Roman Church alone; its effect was to sever them from the communion of the church universal: the words of Eusebius are absolutely unequivocal: ἀποτέμνει . . . τῆς κοινῆς ἑνώσεως.[55] In taking this drastic, and perhaps too hasty step,

[52] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 1-8.

[53] Do, 9.

[54] F. X. Kraus, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, 4th French Edit., Paris, 1898, I, 205. "Là-dessus, continue Eusèbe, le pape Victor *voulut* excommunier les évêques de toute l'Asie (*Asia proconsularis*) et des provinces voisines et il publia à ce sujet plusieurs lettres; mais *ce dessein* ne convint pas à tous les évêques et plusieurs l'engagèrent à se montrer plus pacifique" (italics mine). Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, I, 144.

[55] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxix, 9.

Victor did not condemn the Quartodeciman as heretics: the qualifying words, *ὡς ἄν*, "as it were", indicate that though the sentence was the same as that meted out to heretics, yet the Bishop of Rome did not assert that the Quartodeciman error was a heresy. And, indeed, so far as can be made out from the evidence at hand, no one ever took Victor to task for committing this blunder.

He had sent his sentence broadcast, no doubt expecting the bishops all over the empire to accept his verdict and act accordingly. If "silence gives consent", it must be admitted that the recipients of the papal letter never entertained any misgivings as to Victor's right to cut off recreant Christians from the catholic communion. Still some bishops believed the extreme measure taken to be out of proportion with the point at issue; and they remonstrated, it appears, in rather vigorous language.[56] Most conspicuous among them was Irenaeus. The letter written to Victor by the bishop of Lyons in the name of his brethren in Gaul began by "stating that on Sunday alone should the mystery of the Lord's resurrection be celebrated"; after which "he respectfully exhorted Victor not to cut off whole churches of God for observing an old custom traditional among them"; then he added:

> The question of the day is not the only issue, but also the manner of observing the fast. Some indeed think they ought to fast but one day; others, two days; still others, more; besides those who make their one day last forty consecutive hours.[57] Furthermore, this difference of

---

[56] It does not appear that Eusebius had within reach those letters, except, of course, that of St. Irenaeus, which he quotes at length; otherwise he could not write: "Their words *are said* to be . . ." *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 10.

[57] Οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσιν τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν. This sentence is a classical *crux interpretum*. Massuet, joining the first three words to the preceding and placing a comma after τεσσαράκοντα read: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν · οἱ δὲ δύο · οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας · οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα, ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινάς συμμετροῦσιν τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτων, and translated: . . . *Alii vero quadraginta. Diurnis pariter ac nocturnis horis computatis diem suum commetiuntur.* This was likewise, he remarks, Rufinus's rendering: *Quidam enim putant uno tantum die observari debere ieiunium, alii duobus, alii vero pluribus, nonnulli etiam quadraginta: ita ut horas diurnas nocturnasque computantes diem suum statuant* (*P. G.*, vii, 197-203). What exactly in this hypothesis is the meaning of the sentence: *Diurnis pariter ac nocturnis horis computatis diem*

observance among the Quartodecimans has not come to existence in our own time, but is traced back to our long past predecessors who, erroneously,[58] it appears, originated the custom through simplicity and ignorance, and transmitted it to later ages. All these nevertheless lived peaceably, as we do live peaceably together; and the divergence on the subject of the fast confirms the unanimity of the faith.

Moreover, the presbyters before Soter, who presided over the church which you now govern, to wit: Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus and Xystus, neither observed the Quartodeciman usage themselves, nor allowed those with them to observe it; they, however, who did not observe the Quartodeciman usage, none the less did deal peaceably with those from the communities where it was observed who happened to come to Rome; even though those who did not follow the Quartodeciman usage were on these occasions feeling stronger opposition to it. Still no one was ever excommunicated for following this custom: on the contrary, the presbyters your predecessors, who did not observe the Quartodeciman usage, used to send the Eucharist to those who came from the communities where that usage was in force.

Furthermore, when the blessed Polycarp visited Rome under Anicetus, and they had some small differences on various topics, they soon agreed, and there was between them no contention on this subject either. For whilst Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp to abandon the custom which he had always kept after the example of John, the Lord's disciple and

---

suum commetiuntur, is not very clear.—Valois, in his edition of Eusebius' *H. E.*, finding it impossible to attach an acceptable meaning to the last clause, kept the received punctuation, and supposed the word ἡμέραν, in this last clause, to be a copyist's mistake for νηστείαν (*P. G.*, xx, 499-504, nn. 74-79). This gives a satisfactory meaning. It is clearly to be supposed, then, that St. Irenaeus speaks of the strict fast observed by the ἀσῖτοι before the paschal celebration, and ending with it. The difficulty is that no diplomatic evidence (in manuscripts and editions) supports this correction. Of course, if the received text be maintained, the expression, "to count forty hours for a day", or "to make the day of forty hours", is quite odd; still with a little good will, it may be sufficiently understood, especially in view of the expression, "their day" used by the writer, which seems to refer back to the first group mentioned above, viz. οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν. The correction advocated by Nolte (*Scheiner Zeitschrift*, VI, part i, p. 119), namely κδ' (24) for τεσσαράκοντα, besides being without documentary support and absolutely gratuitous, makes Irenaeus utter a mere truism if, as noted above, he was speaking of the strict fast of the ἀσῖτοι.

[58] Παρὰ τὸ ἀκριβές evidently does not mean "accurately", but just the opposite. This use of the prep. παρὰ is by no means exceptional, and the context demands it.

the other Apostles with whom he had associated, neither could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe the Quartodeciman usage, for the latter said he ought to maintain the custom of the presbyters who preceded him, yet the communion was maintained between them, and in the church Anicetus sent the Eucharist to Polycarp, as a public mark of honor, and they parted in peace. All the faithful, indeed, whether Quartodecimans or not, lived in harmony.[59]

The ever well-informed Eusebius, who entertained a well-deserved admiration for the Bishop of Lyons, does not omit to note in passing that Irenaeus on this occasion wrote in the same vein to many other bishops.[60] "Irenaeus", he concludes, "was true to his name, a peace-maker in word and deed".[61] This mild play on Irenaeus' name is rather provoking. From it we are led to believe that peace was restored and, therefore, the sentence of excommunication withdrawn. But how, when, in what form? Deponent sayeth not. This is another of the many instances where the student must be satisfied with an humble *docte nescire*.

We know, though, that during the course of the third century, a split occurred in the ranks of the Quartodecimans. Before the fall of Jerusalem the Jews had always celebrated the 14th of Nisan at the full moon *following* the spring equinox; but after 70 A. D., this astronomical detail was overlooked or disregarded, and so not unfrequently the Jewish Pasch fell *before* the equinox. Some Quartodecimans followed them;[62] others held for the observance of the more correct old calculation, in justification of which Anatolius, the learned Bishop of Laodicaea of Syria wrote a

[59] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 11-17.

[60] Do., 18. A sentence of St. Jerome's *De Viris Ill.: Feruntur et aliae ad Victorem episcopum Romanum de quaestione Paschae epistolae* (*De Viris Ill.*, xxxv, *P. L.*, xxiii, 649), intimates that Irenaeus wrote a number of letters to Victor on this topic, however, the short description of the contents of those letters (*in quibus commonet eum non facile debere unitatem collegii scindere*) does not go beyond what Eusebius quotes. It is true that he may, without saying it, quote from different letters.

[61] Do.

[62] Eus., *H. E.*, VII, xxxii, 15. They were styled "*protopaschitae*". In the discussions which occurred later we hear a great deal in this connection about "Judaizers". They were very likely those who clung to the erroneous Jewish date.

treatise.[63] May it not be that this internal divergence, on top of the divergences in regard to the length of the fast, mentioned by Irenaeus, brought finally the Asiatics to resipiscence, that is, to conform with the Church at large? From the wording of a sentence of Anatolius [64] some historians conclude that at the time of his writing (276) this happy consummation had at length been reached. The contrary is the truth, for the Bishop of Laodicaea, speaking of the Jewish mode of reckoning the pasch, notes: *Quorum exemplum sequentes usque hodie omnes Asiae episcopi . . . .*[65] At any rate, what they had not yet done in 276, the Bishops of Asia accomplished before 325, for Emperor Constantine mentions them explicitly among those who observed the Roman custom.[66]

No more fit conclusion may be given to this sketch than a brief statement of the theological consequences implied in this Paschal question episode.

This episode marks truly a turning point in the history of the Church. Hackneyed as has become the expression, I find none describing more aptly the part played by the facts just narrated in the development of Church polity. A local friction became by the sheer force of uncontrollable circumstances a problem of the Church universal, and forced Victor to interfere with the customs of a whole group of Christian communities in Asia. About one hundred years before, Clement had already done so by his famous letter to the Corinthians. But after these one hundred years what a difference! Rome has actually become the center of the life of the Church: Rome is in correspondence with all the churches throughout the empire; to Rome letters are sent from abroad with the request that they be communicated to all. Yet more: Rome now holds a position and wields a power which are acknowledged abroad: for Victor writes to the provinces, requesting the holding of synods; and everywhere synods are convened; he threatens and then fulminates excommunication from the

[63] Eus., *H. E.*, VII, xxxii, 13-19.
[64] *P. G.*, x, 217.
[65] Do.
[66] Eus., *Vita Const.*, *P. G.*, xx, 1077.

Church universal; bishops, to be true, express doubts about the opportuneness of this measure, but not one of them denies his right to do so, or thinks the Bishop of Rome has overstepped the limits of this right and assumed an authority hitherto unknown. What matters it that the sentence was recalled? It is the principle that counts; and this principle is acknowledged on all sides. Christianity is no longer a loose aggregate of local communities: it is truly the Church Catholic, Apostolic—*and* ROMAN. Rome is the head with which, as Irenaeus then affirms in a well-known passage, "on account of its greater authority, must agree every church in which was ever maintained the tradition derived from the Apostles".[67] And the Bishop of Rome is the head of the universal Church, for, as Duchesne pointedly remarks after narrating the facts rehearsed above: "How are we to speak, if we are not allowed to call by the title of head of the Church him who wields such a power"?[68] We may not say with Renan: "The Papacy was born"; for the Papacy was born more than one hundred and sixty years before in the plain of Caesarea Philippi; but we may declare—and that is what he meant:—"The Papacy had reached man's estate".

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C. M.

---

[67] The original text is lost: *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab Apostolis traditio* (*Haer.*, III, iii, 2; *P. G.*, vii, 849). Without discussing this text at any length, let us remark only that: 1. *principalitas* refers, as the context clearly indicates, to the prerogative attaching to the Church of Rome from the fact that it was founded by, and lives on the tradition of the two greatest Apostles; 2. *Convenire* has the sense of "to agree"; 3. *Omnem ecclesiam* is obviously not "all the Church", but "every Church"; 4. The expression *eos qui sunt undique fideles* recalls that found twice in the text of Irenaeus quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, xxiv, 14: τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτούς, and 15: τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν τηροῦσιν; 5. *In qua* grammatically and logically refers to *Omnem ecclesiam*.

[68] *Eglises Séparées*, p. 144.

MISCELLANY

THE VATICAN SCHOOL OF PALAEOGRAPHY, DIPLOMATICS, AND ARCHIVISTICS

The year 1883, the sixth of the pontificate of Leo XIII, is an outstanding one in the annals of ecclesiastical historiography. This date marks the opening of the Vatican Archives, under well defined regulations, to the scholars of the world. In a letter dated August 18, 1883, to Cardinal De Luca, Vice-Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church, to Cardinal Pitra, Librarian of the Holy Roman Church, and to Cardinal Hergenroether, Prefect of the Vatican Archives, the learned Pope placed at the disposal of scholars the great historical deposits of the Vatican for purposes of scientific research.

In the following year, Leo XIII, by his *Motu Proprio* of May 1, founded in the Vatican Archives an institute for palaeography and diplomatics that has since come to be known as the *Scuola Vaticana di Paleografia Diplomatica ed Archivistica.* On May 15, His Holiness addressed a letter to Cardinal Hergenroether, in which the scholarly custodian of the Archives of the Vatican was designated the head of the new school.

In his *Motu Proprio,* the Pontiff outlined the two courses that were to be given in the school: the first was to comprise fundamental notions of general palaeography, ecclesiastical and historical diplomatics and comparative chronology after the Christian era; the second was to embrace the practical application of given rules and the study of the acts and historical documents touching the more important epochs of Church History as well as the various systems of archival arrangement, both ancient and modern. Both courses were to be accompanied by practical exercises in reading and deciphering original documents or their facsimiles.

This program of studies obtained during the professorship of Monsignor Isidore Carini, but under the second professor, the Rev. Dr. Angelus Melampo, the courses in Church History and historical criticism were no longer included. In 1913, the Rev. Dr. Bruno Katterbach, O. F. M., was appointed professor and he has uniformly adhered to the program which was published in a letter sent by Cardinal Gasquet, Archivist of the Vatican, to the Bishops of Italy, dated November 6, 1923. The courses as now given are the following:

The Course in Palaeography

The course of lectures in Palaeography is of a theoretical and practical character. These are illustrated by the inspection of selected codices from the Vatican Library. Aside from the lectures, the students are exercised in the reading, transcription, and datation of the volumes.

I. *Introduction.*

1. The concept of Palaeography.
2. The scope of Latin Palaeography.
3. The history of Palaeography.
4. General conspectus of the development in the centres of Latin culture to the 16th century. The division of Latin writing: a. In the centres of Roman culture from the 3 and 4-8th century; b. In the centres of Romano-Germanic culture among Benedictine writers (6-12th century); in the age of the great universities (12-14th century); c. In the centres of modern culture (Humanism).
5. Bibliography: manuals, collections of facsimiles for the use of the school, large collections of facsimiles.

II. *The Ancient Roman Majuscule Writing.*

1. The origin of Latin writing.
2. The epigraphic capital.
3. The cursive capital.

III. *The Codex in the Centres of Roman Culture.*

1. Capital book writing.
2. Uncial writing.
3. Cursive minuscule writing.
4. Semi-uncial writing.
5. The miniatures in the Roman codex.
6. Abbreviations.
7. The codex as such, its make-up, writing, ink, instruments for writing.

IV. *The Codex in the Centres of Romano-Germanic Culture.*

1. The Visigothic centres: a. characteristics; b. different periods; c. principal centres; d. miniatures.

2. The Merovingian centres: a. principal groups and centres and their characteristics; b. miniatures in these centres.
3. The Beneventan centres: a. the various centres in Italy, Dalmatia, etc.; b. general characteristics; c. periods; d. miniatures.
4. The centres of northern Italy.
5. Germanic Pre-Carolingian.

V. *The Codex in the Centres of Insular Culture.*

1. Irish writing and miniature.
2. Anglo-Saxon writing and miniature.
3. The insular movement on the continent.

VI. *The Carolingian Reform.*

1. The origin and development of the minuscule Carolingian to the middle of the 12th century; characteristics. Arabic numerals.
2. The revival of ancient majuscule writing, capitals, uncials and semi-uncials.
3. Carolingian miniatures: a. illuminated volumes of this period; b. the various centres: Rhenish group, Tours-Marmoutiers, Rheims-Metz; Franco-Saxon, Corbie; Alemannic, St. Gall; Fulda-Würzburg; Bavarian and Austrian, Ratisbon, Salzburg; c. the centres of the 11th and 12th centuries in Germany, France, Northern and Central Italy, Spain and England.

VII. *The Codex in the Epoch of the great Mediaeval Universities* (the so-called Gothic Period).

1. The writing: a. book-writing; b. cursive; c. chancellery.
2. Miniature, French, English, German, Flemish, Italian, Spanish.

VIII. *The Codex in the Humanistic Period.*

1. Humanistic writing: book and cursive.
2. Miniature in the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century: in Italy, Spain, France; Flemish, Dutch, German and English miniature.

The Course in Diplomatics

The course is comprised of lectures and reading exercises from the *Specimina palaeographica Regestorum Romanorum Pontificum*, the registers of papal Petitions and other registers.

I. *Introduction.*
   1. The meaning of Diplomatics.
   2. The purpose of Diplomatics touching the document and its relative chancellery.
   3. The development of Diplomatics. Bibliography, manuals.

II. *General Notions.*
   1. The nature of a document; its definition; classification; acts.
   2. The framers of a document.
   3. The parts of a document; intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics; text and protocol.
   4. The transmission of a document: original, copy, falsification.

III. *Introduction to Papal Diplomatics.*
   1. Historical development; bibliography.
   2. Bibliography for the understanding of certain expressions, offices, persons, places, etc.
   3. Concept of a papal document. Various offices of emanation of papal documents; division of documents according to the offices issuing them.

IV. *The Apostolic Datary.*
   1. Papal Petitions.
   2. Records of Petitions.
   3. Formulary of Petitions.

V. *The Motu Proprio Cedula and the Consistorial Cedula.*

VI. *Pontifical Documents emanating through the Medium of the Apostolic Chancellery.*
   A. *In General:*
      1. The various periods from the beginning of the Chancellery to the reign of Leo XIII.

2. The extrinsic characteristics of Papal Bulls in the different periods; writing material, etc.
3. Intrinsic characteristics.

B. *In Particular:*

1. First period (to Adrian I).
2. Second period (Adrian I to Innocent III).
   a. Major Bulls to Leo IX (with the collaboration of the Pope.
   b. Major Bulls from Leo IX to Paschal II.
   c. Major Bulls from Paschal II to Innocent III.
   d. Minor Bulls (without the collaboration of the Pope) to Innocent III. Closed Letters.
   e. The organism of the Papal Chancellery to 1198.
   f. The Registers to 1198.
   g. The Formularies to 1198.
3. Third Period (1198-1431).
   A. From Innocent III to John XXII.
      a. Major Bulls.
      b. The Solemn Bulls of the time of Alexander IV.
      c. The Letters *with silken cord.*
      d. The Bulls *with hempen cord* (executive, common).
      e. The Formula of the *Oath.*
      f. Chancellery notes.
   B. From John XXII to Eugene IV.
   C. The Chancellery to 1198.
   D. The Registers from 1198.
   E. Official Manuals; private collections of formularies.
4. Fourth Period (from Eugene IV to Leo XIII).

VII. *Pontifical Documents emanating through the Medium of the Secretariates* (Papal Briefs).

1. Issuance through the Secretariates to 1487.
2. The Apostolic Secretariate (1487-1678). Ordinary method.
3. The Secret Secretariate.

VIII. *Mediaeval Chronology.*

1. The date of the day.

2. The date of the month.
3. The date of the year.
4. Different methods of reckoning years.
5. Different ways of beginning the year.
6. The dating of papal documents.
7. The various cycles: solar, dominical letter, lunar cycle, the 19-year cycle, golden number, lunar letter, the epact, concurrences, paschal limits, etc.
8. The date of Easter.
9. Controversies on the celebration of Easter.

The Course in Archivistics

I. *Introduction.*

1. Bibliography: Manuals, important articles, printed catalogues and collections, reports of various archives, etc.
2. General notions:
   a. Definition and scope of Archivistics.
   b. Definition, scope and utility of archives; different kinds of archives, episcopal, capitular, parochial, of pious foundations, of confraternities.
   c. The history of the chief mediaeval and modern archives.

II. *External organization of an archive.*

Suitable place, safe, fire-proof, dry, clean, etc.

III. *Internal organization of an archive.*

1. Formation of an archive in general.
2. Content of an archive. Various treasures can be housed in an archive, codices, *incunabula* and other rarities, however, as a rule, archival material properly so called is limited to:
   a. Documents.
   b. Acts.
   c. Writings.
3. The arrangement in an archive.
   a. General placing of archival material.
   b. Special placing of certain archival material.

4. The inventory of archival material—catalogues, indexes, registers.
   a. Necessity of a complete catalogue.
   b. Cataloguing and numbering of documents, of volumes, and of the pages of the same.
   c. Rules for the formation of the catalogues.
   d. Rules for the formation of the indexes.
   e. Rules for the formation of the registers.
5. Method of applying the above rules to an archive without order or badly arranged.

IV. *Preservation of archival treasures.*

1. Repairing:
   a. Diseases and damage of archival matter.
   b. Repair of damage.
   c. The use of chemicals.
2. Definite periodic revision and control of the material in the archive.

V. *The use of an archive.*

1. General rules.
2. Service for the advantage of scholars:
   a. Generosity of the archivist in granting the use of the indexes, etc.
   b. Cautions in the study of archival materials.
   c. Practical vigilance for the safeguarding of material.
   d. Reservations and loaning.

VI. *The proper method of publishing archival material.*

1. Scientific and practical preparation.
2. Method of publishing the texts.
3. Preferred forms of publication.

In the teaching of Archivistics, the course is given an eminently practical character. For this purpose, the student is familiarized with the surroundings and the activities of the archives. The purpose of the lectures is to form learned, conscientious and practical custodians of the treasures to be found in archives, particularly those of the Church.

Lectures on the Historical and Canonical Status of the Sacred Congregations, Tribunals and Offices of the Roman Curia.

Introduction

1. Definition, authority and place of the Roman Curia.
2. Division of the Roman Curia.
3. The importance of a knowledge of the historical and canonical development of the Sacred Congregations, Tribunals and Offices of the Roman Curia for archivists.
4. Sketch of the lectures on this development.

I. *General Section.*

1. Dogmatic and juridic foundation of the institutions of the Sacred Congregations, Tribunals and Offices of the Roman Curia.
2. Juridic history: institution, internal organization, competence, manner of expediting their business and writing their acts.

a. To the great Reform of Sixtus V.
b. The Reform of Sixtus V.
c. To the Reform of Pius X.
d. The Reform of Pius X.
e. To the Code of Canon Law.
f. Prescriptions of the Code of Canon Law.

II. *Special Section.*

In this section, an historical and canonical account is given of each of the Sacred Congregations, Tribunals and Offices according to the following points:

a. Origin, institution, modification, eventual suppression.
b. Internal organization.
c. Competence.
d. Manner of expediting business.
e. Manner of writing the acts.
f. Brief notices on the archives (place, condition, accessibility).

The School of Archivistics, comprising the courses in Archivistics and on the Roman Curia, was instituted by Pius XI, in a letter of the Cardinal Secretary of State, April 15, 1923.

The professors of the *Scuola Vaticana* have been the following: Monsignor Isidore Carini, 1884-1895; Rev. Dr. Angelus Melampo,

1895-1913; Rev. Dr. Bruno Katterbach, O. F. M., 1913-1915 and 1920—. All the professors have been officials in the Archives of the Holy See. The school was closed from 1915 till 1920 as a result of the war. With the introduction of the new courses in 1923, Dr. Katterbach was appointed Professor of Archivistics and Rev. Justinian Seredi, O. S. B., was appointed Professor of the course on the Roman Curia. In 1927, Father Seredi was made Primate of Hungary and elevated to the Cardinalate. His chair is now occupied by the Rev. Felix M. Cappello, S. J.

On the completion of the courses, a protracted examination, both written and oral, is held in all the subjects. The successful students are given the diploma of *Palaeographus ac Archivarius*. Between 1887 and 1928, seventy-three diplomas were awarded. The entire school is directed by the Archivist of the Vatican, at present His Eminence, Aidan Cardinal Gasquet.

Pius XI, a specialist in all the branches taught in the *Scuola Vaticana*, has ever taken a lively interest in its work. Each year he accords the students a private audience of some length in which he encourages their interest in the auxiliary sciences to history, stressing the need particularly of forming well equipped historians and archivists in each diocese to preserve and to transmit to posterity the precious archival treasures of the Church.

G. B. Stratemeier, O. P.

THE LATEST WORKS ON BLOCK BOOKS

The block books form a very interesting class of fifteenth-century books. They are struck from wooden blocks on which the text of a full page is engraved and called therefore, xylographica. The art of printing such books goes by the name of xylography. A considerable controversy has raged around these early books, some antedating them to the typographical productions, while others consider them posterior to the art of printing with movable type.

C. H. Heineken, in his *Idée générale d'une collection d'estampes* (Leipzig, 1771), was the first scholar to describe block books. Among the numerous publications of later date dealing with them we mention Sotheby (*Principia typographica*, London, 1858), Berjeau (*Livres xylographiques*. London, 1865), Weigel and Zestermann (*Anfaenge*

der Druckerkunst, Leipzig, 1866) and finally Wilh. Lud. Schreiber's *Manuel de l'amateur de la gravure sur bois et sur métal au XV. siècle.* The fourth volume of this monumental work (Berlin, 1902) describes in 464 pages, copies of 98 editions of xylographical books printed prior to 1520. This is the standard work on the subject.

The block books do not vary much in their character. They treat mainly of Bible History and moral instruction. There are a few books dealing with profane history and natural science, as these were then understood.

The particular purpose of this class of books has been baffling scholars for a long time. Even W. L. Schreiber, who has been studying them from an artist's viewpoint, has failed to point out their true nature. The block books are nothing else but mnemonical helps for pupils in common schools. They were devised as substitutes for the very expensive textbooks of the time and they served as ingenious means for facilitating the teaching of children. They carry us back to the times when textbooks were a rarity in common school, and oral teaching was made almost exclusively the vehicle for imparting knowledge.

The mnemonical character explains the great uniformity in execution. We understand now, why there is in undated block books little to show the difference in time and place of production. The rude execution is not always the result of deficiency on the part of the artist; it is rather a studied design to make the schoolbooks more serviceable to their particular purpose, viz., to assist the memory in recalling, and impressing the lessons, taught by them. The block books serve medieval instruction and do not claim to be regarded as productions of fine art practised for its own sake; they are monuments of a time when instruments for intellectual instruction had been rather rare. Although they were not primarily designed to educate the eye in the perception of beauty, they created a popular appreciation and knowledge of art and brought beautiful designs within the reach of the masses. George E. Woodberry, who like many other scholars failed to discover the real purpose of block books, surely missed the mark in regarding them "as monuments of the poverty of the civilization" which produced them (*History of Wood-Engraving,* New York, 1883, p. 44).

Schreiber's *Manuel,* Vol. IV. has remained the final work on block books to this day. Since then only one work of importance has appeared, viz., Franz Luttor's *Biblia Pauperum* (Veszprem, 1912).

Scholars, however, have been more active of late in publishing facsimile reproductions of these medieval books.

J. Ph. Berjeau's *Biblia Pauperum* (London, 1859) was the first facsimile reproduction of a block book. Despite the expensive method of reproduction, several other block books have been multiplied in the course of time. However, modern inventions have made reproduction quite inexpensive as compared with older methods. Scholars have utilized modern methods in making block books accessible to the ordinary book buyer in rather cheap facsimile reproductions.

There are various serial publications which edit facsimile reproductions of block books. The *Veroeffentlichungen der Graphichen Gesellschaft* at Berlin (since 1906) have issued six works thus far: *Biblia Pauperum, Decalogus, Septimania, Exercitium super Pater Noster, Dodes Dantz, and Servatius-Legende.* The firm P. Heitz in Strassburg has issued the *Biblia Pauperum* (1903). The *Zwickauer Faksimile-Drucke* published the *Canticum Canticorum* (1910). In Munich were reproduced the *Symbolum Apostolicum* (1924) and *Speculum humanae salvationis* (1925), and in Leipzig the *Defensorium Virginis Mariae* (1925). Other reproductions are in preparation or planned, so that before long we will have accessible in facsimile reproductions the whole series of block books. The price of these modern reprints, which serve the same purpose as their high-priced originals, range from three dollars to twenty-five dollars. Specimens of all block books are given in Schreiber's *Manuel,* Vol. VII-VIII. Berlin, 1895-1900, on 86 plates, one plate for each book.

The block books, as far as we are able to localize them, are productions of Germany and the Netherlands. Only one book can be assigned to France and one to Italy. We naturally expect German scholars to devote such an amount of labor and money to the study and reproduction of these books of their ancestors. It is worthy of note that the leading men in this movement are and have always been non-Catholics. Actuated both by patriotic and ideal motives, these German scholars and publishers have spared neither pains nor money to make accessible to the educated people of our days the instruments employed by the medieval teachers to instill Catholic doctrine into the minds of Catholic children on the eve of the Reformation. The editors of these Catholic school books do not care for the ideas which the illustrations in the picture-books convey. They look upon them rather as curious monuments of a bygone age which "reveal the unprofitableness of medieval thought" (Woodberry *op. cit.* p. 44).

Although the once popular block books have long ago lost all attraction for Catholic and Protestant alike, they are avidly collected at prohibitive prices by bibliophiles. As the result of their readiness to pay almost any price, the block books are soaring high in the book market. A well preserved copy of a block book will net $10,000. Catholic scholars are greatly indebted to Protestant bibliophiles who place these monuments of medieval culture at our disposal and who jealously guard the productions of their Catholic ancestors.

JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.

BOOK REVIEWS

Universal Knowledge, A Dictionary and Encyclopedia of Arts and Sciences, History and Biography, Law, Literature, Religions, Nations, Races, Customs, and Institutions. Edited by JOHN J. WYNNE, S. J., EDWARD A. PACE, THOMAS J. SHAHAN, CONDE B. PALLEN, and JAMES J. WALSH. Volume II. (New York: Universal Knowledge Foundation, Inc., 1928. Pp. 1778.)

Subscribers to *Universal Knowledge* who have carefully perused the first volume will welcome the second volume of this twelve-volume popularized encyclopedia which offers such splendid supplement to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* edited by the same group. Well printed, beautifully illustrated, imposing in format, this volume of 890 full pages contains some 2913 articles embracing in a more or less authoritative character all knowledge which can be conveniently organized from "B to Byzantium". As in any encyclopedia, there is wide variation in the scholarly merits and demerits of the different articles. Some of them are written by authorities who sign their initials and whose identity can be learned from the key to the list of contributors printed in the appendix. A large proportion of the short articles, especially those dealing with less important subjects, are unsigned. Some of them are obviously compiled. It is to be hoped that the list of scholarly writers can be extended so that most of the articles in succeeding volumes can be based upon an even wider reading of secondary accounts. This is a work which should appeal to Catholic writers regardless of the necessarily small compensation. A large number of priests and professional men might give some time to this type of service. It is permanent. It should be made an example of Catholic contribution to true American scholarship. This, no doubt, is exactly the aim of the editors. On the whole their purpose is likely to be attained in part if one may judge from the first two volumes.

Glancing through the volume, one is challenged by the variety of the contents: Bancroft, Balzac, Babylonia, Bahamas, Belgium, Balance of trade, Balboa, Brazil, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Berlin, Buffalo, Buenos Aires, Boston, Baltimore, Brooklyn, Bolshevism, Bismarck, Botticelli, Blucher, Brian Boru, Baseball, Boxing, Billiards, Bridge, Book binding, Battleships, James Gordon Bennett, Bering Sea, Bermudas, and

Bertillon. In these pages doctors of the Church are jostled by popes, scientists, bishops, artists, composers, engineers, journalists, sportsmen, and missionaries. Creedal and racial lines seem to be ignored. There is remarkable fairness in the sketches which I have read. Where the *Catholic Encyclopedia* was weak in biography, *Universal Knowledge* appears strong. One notes articles on Bates College (Baptist) of Maine, Boston College (a Jesuit school), Boston University (Methodist), and Bonn University in Prussia. There are good accounts of Benedictines and Bollandists. Geographical and commercial information is stressed. Latin-American material is emphasized to a fair degree.

General readers, as well as students in high school and college, will find this volume of *Universal Knowledge* a mine of useful, available information over a wide range of subjects which can be classified under the second letter of the alphabet.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

Founders of the Middle Ages. By EDWARD KENNARD RAND. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928. Pp. 365.)

It seems to be the misfortune of the Middle Ages to be uniformly misunderstood by being considered as either pretty much a part of the preceding dark period or as having suddenly sprung into being for no assignable reason. The truth is that they are the fruition of a sowing that goes back to the dying days of the Roman Empire, followed by the fallow years of the Dark Ages. Hence Dr. Rand is amply justified in speaking of the great thinkers of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries as the Founders of the Middle Ages. Put in another way, and this is the way the author thinks of it, the intellectual growth of Christianity in the early centuries posed the problem, "What are we going to do with the pagan culture of our ancestors?" The thinkers whom he considers gave the two solutions, incorporation with adaptation, and rejection; and the Middle Ages made the choice following the trend of the greatest of these thinkers. It is the object of the present book to expose the mental equipment of the men who were to interest and influence very profoundly the mediaeval scholastic, Ambrose, Jerome, Boethius, Augustine and others. Yet, it is important to note that its author seems primarily interested as a devotee of the Latin classics. It is incense for the shrine of Vergil and

Cicero, deities worthy enough in truth, rather than for that of the Fathers. But this does not detract from the book. On the contrary, it makes it far more convincing. If a classicist can admire the attitude taken up by the Founders of the Middle Ages, it would seem that there is little to be said for the tradition of Catholic opposition to culture. We commend especially the author's protest against the disparagement of the Latin Fathers by modern scholars who seem resolved to trace everything back to Greek sources. In this connection we should note the influence of Latin thinkers, writers and poets, Cicero, Virgil, Lucretius, upon the Latin Fathers. It is more considerable than seems to be generally recognized.

Space does not permit a profounder analysis of one of the most delightful books of its kind. It is no small compliment to say that the volume was found very entertaining. There is a "tang" to the translations that conceals the fact that they are not in the original. Its aim can best be expressed by the following quotation (page 280):

> If we begin with the writers of the Middle Ages . . . and attempt to ascertain the mind of the Mediaeval Church about Pagan literature, we shall be balked in our quest. . . . The views of any mediaeval author about the Classics were formed . . . by what was transmitted from the past under the sanction of a Lactantius, an Ambrose, a Jerome, an Augustine a Boethius . . . it is impossible . . . to be blind to one great fact—that before the Middle Ages came on, the Pagan authors were immovably fixed in Christian education.

We can only commend these words to the attention of some of our modern educators who seem to date all modern culture from 1453.

No patristic scholar, no one interested in the thought of the Middle Ages, no modern educator interested in the real roots of modern culture can fail to profit from a perusal of this book.

G. B. STRATEMEIER, O. P.

The Official Catholic Year Book for 1928. (New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1928. Pp. 737.)

Under the supervision of Bishops Walsh of Newark, Kelly of Oklahoma, and Noll of Fort Wayne, Indiana, Kennedy and Sons have just published the first volume of the *Official Catholic Year Book*. It is a most useful compilation for Catholics and non-Catholics who are interested in the varied activities of the Catholic Church in the

33939

United States and in the work of the National Catholic Welfare Conference as a central clearing house. While this reviewer does not care to write enthusiastic book advertisements, he has not seen a specialized year book which contains in convenient form so much valuable material for editors, sociologists, and students of current events. It will be quite as necessary in reference libraries as on clerical book-shelves, for information concerning the Catholic Church is welcomed by all groups: those who accept and love her, those who tolerate, and those who hate. The *Year Book* is more than a collection of statistics, it is a chronicle of Catholic activities which it would be difficult to find elsewhere.

A church calendar, list of patron saints, American causes of canonization, canonizations under Pope Pius XI, a chronology (July 31, 1927 to August 1, 1928) of the principal events in Catholic circles in the United States and abroad (p. 26-69), encyclicals of Pope Pius XI translated by Mgr. James H. Ryan, rector of the Catholic University of America, and the national pastoral of the American hierarchy on the Mexican persecution. "A Brief History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States including a Statement of the Doctrine, Polity and Organization . . . together with a Summary of the Outstanding Events of Catholic Interest in the U. S. covered in the Report of the U. S. Census of Religious Bodies, 1926" is reprinted with the consent of the Director of the Census. This subject might have been written for the *Year Book*. Reprints are rarely advisable. One wonders, incidentally, if there were Irish Catholics in Calvert's expedition of 1634 (p. 110). The toned-down sentences concerning Know-Nothing activity is so lukewarm as to be unhistorical (p. 112). Father Stratemeier of the Catholic University has compiled brief biographical notes about some thirty of the early Catholic explorers. Mr. Montavon of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has a summary of the religious situation in Mexico (pp. 130-143). There follows a list of the popes from St. Peter to Pius XI, a list of the cardinals, a description of the Curia and its separate congregations, a list of apostolic delegates throughout the world, and a list of the sees and vicariates throughout the world.

There is a list of the American hierarchy: cardinals, archbishops, bishops, archabbot and abbots. Under promotions and appointments, there are biographical notices of new bishops. This is followed by a brief summary of the organization of every diocese (pp. 182-308).

There are useful lists of the monsignori and deans by dioceses, of seminaries, novitiates and houses of study. It requires fifty pages to print statistics of the various religious orders and communities. The bureau of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference contributes a good section on Catholic education. It would seem that the Catholic University of America should be given a few pages and not remain lost in a long list of colleges. The list of diocesan school boards is a handy supplement to this section.

Catholic charities are well tabulated with a list of 612 hospitals including three in Alaska, an account of the Catholic Hospital Association, the Catholic Guild for nurses, Catholic Medical Board, and a survey of charitable institutions and agencies. Father R. A. McGowan has a noteworthy article on Catholics and the Labor Problem; Miss Sarah Weadick of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has a comprehensive survey of immigration and its problem; Father Edwin O'Hara has a brief sketch of Rural Life Work; Miss Elizabeth B. Sweeney of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has an article on Catholic Racial Elements which can be improved in a later edition; Mr. Charles McMahon has a survey of the organization of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Mr. D. J. Ryan contributes an instructive study on the World War; and Father Peter Guilday has a few pages on Catholic Historical Societies. A considerable section is allotted to "lay organization".

Under "A Bibliography of Important Catholic Books" appear a list of books offered by the various publishers (some of old vintage) but in some instances this is deceiving, for some of the books listed are not by Catholic writers or especially Catholic in tone. This list in a new edition should be classified according to subject and only strictly Catholic books or those by Catholic authors included. There might also be a list of especially noteworthy volumes in foreign tongues, for fortunately no small percentage of the Catholic population read another language than English, an asset which they should strive to retain.

The Laetare Medal awards (1888-1928) are listed, as well as a list by dioceses of the "titled laymen and laywomen". The forms of ecclesiastical salutation, written and oral, will be useful to speakers and journalists. All in all, this is a useful book which no doubt will be much improved in its annual reissues. It offers a striking commentary on the successful work of the Church in the United States.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

The New England Clergy and the American Revolution. By ALICE M. BALDWIN. (Duke University Press, 1928. Pp. 222.)

Professor Baldwin of Duke University has revised her doctoral dissertation written under Professors McLaughlin and Jernegan of the University of Chicago into a useful, if not highly interesting, study of the part played by the Congregational ministry in a puritanical agitation against English rule, in giving religious sanction to revolutionary political views, and in giving heart and stamina to the patriot party. Much has been written on the general subject, but nowhere will the student find the political-religious activity of the Congregational preachers so fully developed. As a daughter, granddaughter, and niece of Congregational divines, the author is not without a filial bias and a desire to tone down the impressions of the New England theocracy left by J. T. Adams and the less pietistic, modern school. She may overestimate the culture and intellectual attainments of the average divine, for too much cannot be argued from graduation from eighteenth century Harvard and Yale. That the leading Congregational ministers were men of ability is not to be doubted, for the ministry offered the best opening for orthodox men of brains from any point of view, whether of power, service, material gain, or of popular applause. Yet on the whole, it is likely that the English-trained Anglican ministers were men of greater breadth and intellectual training. Nor are all the Baptist and Methodist parsons to be too lightly evaluated.

The Congregational clergy were rebels with a seventeenth century background. To them the struggle against George III was a continuation of the revolt against Charles I and James II. It was a fight to retain their power in secular as well as religious affairs. This power was on the wane, with liberalism breaking their own ranks, with dissenting Baptist and Methodist exhorters winning the lowly, with the rising influence and wealth of Anglicans, and the growing interest of the Church of England in its half-persecuted adherents in Puritan New England. Again there was the rise of the lay leader. In New England, there was religious sectionalism. Non-conformists were demanding more concessions—complete freedom from Congregational tithes, their own schools, and colleges, full suffrage, elimination of what in practice amounted to religious tests for elective offices, and in the case of Anglicans an American episcopate. Appeals to England gave encouragement to non-conformists. Then there was the

Quebec Act, which the author unfortunately ignores along with the narrow intolerance of some of the most patriotic parsons. She does emphasize the incessant campaign of the Congregational ministry to maintain its theocratic power and to popularize democratic theories of local government and hostility to the British connection. She shows their close association with the lay leaders, with the machinery of the patriot party, and with the suppression of Tories and Churchmen. She makes very apparent the sectarian causes of the Revolution in New England. The author's thesis foot-notes the oft-quoted statement of the English official, Chief Justice Oliver, regarding ministerial activity in 1774-1776: "As to their Pulpits many of them were converted into Gutters of Sedition, the Torrents bore down all before them. The Clergy had quite unlearned the Gospel, and had substituted Politicks in its Stead."

Such studies as Miss Baldwin's enable one to divorce himself from the school-book stories of the Revolution. It contributes to a more thorough understanding of the religious-political-economic campaign in old New England which culminated in the Revolutionary War and Independence. It should force the reader to realize that the causes of the Revolution varied from section to section. Campaign cries were general and embraced all the colonies, but certain fundamental causes may have been vital in one section and silenced in another. Virginia patriots were not incensed at the Church of England. Catholic leaders in Maryland were not aggrieved when toleration was granted Quebec. New Englanders had no grievances against proprietary families, Penns or Baltimores. The Irish Presbyterian on the frontier was not worried when the sugar and molasses acts were enforced, nor did the stamp duty fall heavily upon him. As in any upheaval, in any political campaign, one must see in a study of the Revolution various causes at work in various sections and among the different racial, religious, and geographical units of the population.

Miss Baldwin has done a good piece of work. She has covered the ground in thorough fashion. A full bibliography and copious foot-notes demonstrate the extent of her researches. And incidentally, Duke University in class-room and press is making its full contribution to the scientific study of American history.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke, herausgegeben von der Kommission fuer den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke. Band I-III. (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1925-1928.)

A group of German scholars are editing this voluminous work. It highly interests the church historian, since it gives a detailed description of all the books printed with moveable type prior to the year 1501. The above-mentioned three first volumes describe 4077 books; seven more volumes will add descriptions of 31,000 others, so that the complete work will comprise a list of 35,000 incunabula.

The greatest accuracy possible is taken in describing that mass of Catholic literature, since every description is based on copies which are extant. There is, however, a certain number of incunabula whose existence is vouched for by documentary evidence, but which have been destroyed completely, so that of whole editions not a single copy has turned up thus far. A certain percentage of other incunabula have perished without leaving any traces. The subject titles of these incunabula will not be registered in this bibliographical work. Accordingly, the *Gesamtkatalog* does not list the sum total of the Catholic book production prior to the year 1501.

The whereabouts of copies of the same editions are given, whenever the number of such copies does not exceed ten. When there are extant more than ten copies of an edition, the enumeration of libraries possessing them remains incomplete; the phrase appended, "and some others", indicates that less than ten copies are omitted, and the other phrase, "and numerous others", that more than ten copies are not mentioned.

The *Gesamtkatalog* is the final work on the subject and represents the result of the labors of a long succession of scholars. The first attempts made to describe the book production of the fifteenth century go back to the seventeenth century. The number of books registered was rather small and the bibliographical method by no means up to the mark. Succeeding scholars made new finds and were more accurate in their descriptions. But even their voluminous works became antiquated by an ever increasing number of editions and corrections. The literature which accumulated in course of time became so extensive that it could not be mastered by a single man. This led to the formation of a *Kommission fuer den Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke.*

In November 1904, the Prussian Minister of Education called a meeting of the foremost bibliographers of the country at Berlin and entrusted a committee with the publication of a catalogue of all known incunabula preserved throughout the world. This committee took an inventory of incunabula treasured up in German libraries, the work being finished in less than five years. The report made on April 1, 1911, states that in 676 libraries there are preserved 145,484 incunabula. Inventories of incunabula of other countries were made either by members of the commission or by representative bibliographers of those nations. The latter was the case in the United States, where a committee appointed by the Bibliographical Society of America prepared and published a check list of all incunabula found in the United States and Canada.

The World War naturally interrupted the work to some extent. It was pushed intensely, as soon as peace was reëstablished, although many years passed before publication was begun. Finally, in October 1925, the first volume appeared and it was to be followed each year by a new volume. The firm could not carry out this stipulation, so that the third volume came off the press eight months after scheduled time.

A work of such magnitude could not be published without the aid of the state and learned societies. The Prussian government paid all the expenses of the commission during twenty years. Various German academic societies, and scholars of all countries helped to finance the printing of the work.

In its arrangement the *Gesamtkatalog* follows the *Repertorium* of Hain which it is to replace. The works are listed alphabetically under the author's name and where this is unknown, under the first word of the title. The separate entries, however, are usually more extensive and always arranged in better form. A new feature is the various references appended to them. Each entry represents a unit ranging from a broadside to a many-volumed work. Since, however, those large books with their endless contractions and abbreviations outnumbered the broadsides and pamphlets, we may safely state that each of the entries corresponds on the average to an ordinary octavo of 500 pages.

Naturally the bulk of fifteenth-century books is couched in the three literary languages, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. However, the vernacular tongues of Europe are represented almost in their entirety.

Books were printed prior to the year 1501 in German, both High and Low, in Flemish, Dutch, Frisian, Swedish, Danish, and English, in Italian, French, Norman-French, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan and Breton, in Bohemian or Czech, Croatian, Old Bulgarian or Church-Slavonic, and Magyar.

Regarding the content, all branches of science are treated in all genera of style. The only thing missing is trash, which is of modern date.

The *Gesamtkatalog* is a monumental work which exhibits, as no other work can do, what the Catholic people did for science and education on the eve of the Reformation. It is a most powerful apology, establishing by irrefragable facts, the Church's claim to being the civilizer of European nations. In view of this high merit of the present work it must be deplored that Catholic scholars, with but rare exceptions, completely ignore the findings of bibliography.

JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.

Der Bilderschmuck der Fruehdrucke. VON ALBERT SCHRAMM. Volumes I-IX. (Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1920-1927. $185.)

This pictorial work is a complement to the *Gesamtkatalog* (reviewed above). Bibliographers have indicated the illustrations of the incunabula in a summary way for the last two centuries. However, Richard Muther was the first scholar who described and reproduced every cut found in German incunabula (*Die Deutsche Buecher Illustration der Gothik und Fruehrenaissance,* two volumes, Munich, 1884). Other scholars dealt with Italian, French, and English illustrated incunabula. Finally, Wilh. Lud. Schreiber attempted to compile a catalogue arranged according to authors in which the woodcuts of 2490 incunabula are fully described (*Manuel de l'amateur de la gravure au XV siècle,* vol. V, 2 parts, Leipzig, 1910-1911).

When the German commission undertook to publish the *Gesamtkatalog,* the book illustration proved the most vexing problem to solve. The final solution was found in the publication of a separate work of description and reproduction, called *Der Bilderschmuck der Fruehdrucke.* The whole work will comprise twenty-eight volumes and will describe and reproduce every illustration found in the incunabula. The illustrations are reproduced in original size from the best models and in the original order. The first volume appeared in 1920. The

volumes I-IX give an aggregate of 8334 illustrations on 1277 plates accompanied by 243 pages of text.

The subject of the illustrations varies naturally according to the titles treated in the books from which they are taken. A cursory glance will reveal the predominance of Biblical and religious subjects and will likewise manifest the hold which the Catholic religion had on the minds of the pre-Reformation people. Nevertheless there are not wanting representations of profane subjects, such as maps, scenes of life, arts and crafts, and some sort of comical cartoons. It is a pity that Church historians did not utilize this valuable source which brings home to us, far better than quotations from contemporary authors, the high standard of culture of the pre-Reformation people.

JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.

Handbuch der Holz und Metallschnitte des XV. Jahrhunderts. VON WILH. LUD. SCHREIBER. Six volumes. (Leipzig, 1926-1928. $75.)

The separate prints of the fifteenth century have been first studied by Heineken (*Idée générale d'une collection d'estampes,* Leipsic, 1771). General catalogues of these prints have appeared, from time to time, as well as facsimile reprints with descriptions. In 1891, Wilh. Lud. Schreiber began to issue a catalogue of all fifteenth-century prints then known in his *Manuel de l'amateur de la gravure sur bois et sur metal au XV siècle.* The first two volumes of this work (Berlin, 1891-1892) describe 2170 woodcuts, and the third volume (Berlin, 1893) describes 809 copper-plate engravings, while volume VI (Berlin, 1893) gives specimens of these various kinds of printing.

New finds necessitated a new edition of this standard work. No less than 2000 hitherto unknown prints are described in the second edition of Schreiber's handbook, so that the total number of fifteenth-century prints is raised to 5000. The French language of the first edition was replaced in the second by German; otherwise the arrangement remained intact. The three volumes of the original had to be enlarged to six quartos of about 200 pages each. The first volume contains Biblical representations; the second, representations of the Blessed Trinity, Christ, and His Mother Mary; the third, those of the Saints; the fourth, mythical and profane subjects; the fifth,

copper-plate engravings of religious and profane subjects; and the sixth, a history of engraving and lists of monograms.

Schreiber's manual in its new edition will remain the standard work on fifteenth-century prints. These prints may be, for the most part, valueless as works of art, but they are of the greatest interest to Church historians. Their purpose is well expressed by G. E. Woodberry (*History of Wood-engraving*, New York, 1883, pp. 24-28). "Rude as they were", he says, "the poor peasant or humble artisan of the cities cared for them; they had been given him by the monks at the end of some pilgrimage or by some preaching friar, or he had received them on some day of festival when they were scattered among the populace by monks. Stuck up on the low walls of his dwelling, they brought home before his eyes in daily sight the reality of that holy living and holy dying of the Saviour and His martyrs in whose intercession and prayer his hope of salvation lay. Throughout the fifteenth and a part of the sixteenth centuries, among the common people these sentiments and customs which gave rise to the holy prints continued without change; and so the workshops of the engravers kept on issuing these saints' images long after the art had produced refined and noble works. It is difficult for a modern mind to realize the place which pictures filled in medieval life, before the invention of printing had brought about that great change which has resulted in making books almost the sole means of education. It was not merely that the paintings upon walls of the churches conveyed more noble conceptions to the peasant and artisan than their slow imagination could build up out of the words of the preacher; like children they apprehended through pictures, they thought out all higher themes in pictures rather than in words; their ideas were pictorial rather than verbal; painting was in spiritual matters more truly a language to them than their own patois. This accounts for the rapid spread of the new art of wood-engraving, and for the popularity and utility of the holy prints which were so widely employed to convey religious ideas and quicken religious sentiment."

In view of this great popularity of prints, the 5000 which are still extant represent a small percentage of the original output. Considering their perishable nature, it is really surprising that so many could have escaped the ravages of time. Mr. Schreiber deserves the gratitude of Catholic scholars for the pains he took in collecting, searching for, and describing productions which at one time had been the powerful instruments for the religious and moral instruction of many a

humble Catholic of pre-Reformation time. He devoted his whole life to the study and collection of these fifteenth-century prints, rendering thereby a great service to the Catholic Church and her cause. Unfortunately, Catholic scholars have ignored through lack of proper appreciation the work of Mr. Schreiber. It may be of interest to know that the firms which published the sumptuous work were non-Catholic.

JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.

Records of the Columbia Historical Society. Volume 29-30. (Washington, D. C. 1928. Pp. 432.)

This volume contains three papers of exceptional interest to the general student of American history: "Colonel William Winston Seaton and his Mayoralty", by Allen A. Clark; "Duelling in the District of Columbia", by Myra L. Spaulding, M. A.; and "America's Part in the Supreme War Council during the World War", by Lieutenant-Colonel U. S. Grant III which no historian of the unified control of military operations can afford to ignore. Articles of more local interest are the excellent study of "The Early Baptists in Washington", by Lucille Warfield Wilkinson; "Recollections of our Sixties", by Albion Keith Parris; "Reminiscences of Mrs. John M. Binckley of Early Days in Washington", by John B. Larner; and "The Founding of the old Georgetown Market", by A. K. Parris.

Colonel W. W. Seaton (1785-1866), a Virginian printer who entered journalism and edited the *Petersburg Republican* and *North Carolina Journal* came to Washington as editor of the famous *National Intelligencer.* As president of the board of aldermen and mayor, he entered fully into the life of the capital which he saw develop from a primitive town to a considerable post-war national center. The first mayor of Washington, the Catholic Robert Brent, had no more worthy successor than this associate of Clay, Webster, Adams, General Scott, Henry Wise, Tyler, and Lafayette. The last named he entertained in his home at a most distinguished gathering of statesmen and diplomats. Mr. Clark in his sketch of Seaton chronicles events of more than passing interest, the inaugural of Harrison with his close friend Colonel William L. Brent as grand marshal, Dickens's visit and inability to remain over a day or two for the St. Patrick's Day celebration, the erection by the German Catholics of St. Mary's Church, the

opposition of the *National Intelligencer* to President Polk's war, the protest of the Washington pastors including those of St. Peter's and St. Matthew's Churches against the persecution of the unhappy Mormons at Nauvoo, the building of the Washington Monument, Irish and Scottish relief meetings, and the S. S. *Princeton* disaster in which a number of prominent figures lost their lives, including two members of the Cabinet.

At the St. Patrick's celebration of 1842, presided over by George Washington Parke Curtis, James Hoban was the chief speaker, while in the following year Curtis, Father J. P. Donelan of St. Matthew's Church, and Mayor Seaton seem to have furnished the headline speeches. As this was in the midst of the Irish repeal movement, Col. Seaton explained that he had no desire to interfere in foreign situations, but that he could not repress his expression of sympathy for suffering fellow-men under whatever government they might live:

> Without undertaking to analyze the sources of the sufferings of Ireland, it is enough for me to know that these sufferings are real, deplorable, and unmerited, to command my deepest commiseration and my sincerest wishes for their alleviation and redress; and I have not the slightest doubt that this sentiment is common to every heart in Christendom; for, sir, there is not, I believe, a people on the face of the earth, who from their national characteristics, receive so large a share of the admiration and cordial good will of other nations as the people of Ireland. Sir, they are favorites wherever the English language is spoken. The brogue is a passport to the heart everywhere, for everywhere it is known to be the accompaniment of valor, and honor, and generosity.

Needless to say the *Intelligencer* gave sympathetic accounts of Irish celebrations and Ireland's grievances during the trying forties with such an editor-in-chief.

On this same occasion President Tyler expressed his regrets for an enforced absence in a letter which was intended as a direct reprimand for nativist intolerance:

> It would give me the greatest pleasure to be with you in your proposed celebration of the anniversary of the Patron Saint of Ireland if my public duties permitted, but these will deny to me this gratification. I may, however, unite with you in expressions of veneration for that great philanthropist, who, periling all in the cause of man, took upon himself the task of spreading civilization and religion over our Emerald Isle, and won an enduring place in the hearts of Irishmen to the latest posterity. The shrine of disinterested philanthropy is that at which all may do reverence.
>
> Nor can I withhold my congratulations at the fact that Heaven has again

vouchsafed to Ireland in the person of Father Mathew, a benefactor whose memory is destined to be cherished when centuries shall have passed away.

For the kind feelings which you have been good enough to express toward me in behalf of the sons of Ireland who have sought in America a shelter and a home, you have my best thanks. I can entertain towards the emigrant from the Old World who has taken up his abode among us no other feelings than those expressed in my message to which you have referred. He who comes hither to worship at the same altar with ourselves—the altar of public liberty—should be received as a brother and welcomed as a member of the same household. For myself, I can never acknowledge a distinction between citizens of the same great Republic, whether born on this or on the other side of the Atlantic. The same constitution protects, and the same rights and privileges appertain to all, and they all alike make common cause in that which is American, and stand equally prepared to repel the invaders of our soil, or drive back innovations upon our political rights (p. 30, March 15, 1843).

During the famine days in Ireland and the Highlands, Seaton's sympathy was deep and his aid substantial. On one occasion he said: "I declare that when I left the office last evening and sat down to dinner, the thought of the famishing Irish, the women and children, I could not eat a mouthful. What can be done." He then sent out a call for a general meeting to consider relief at which the great Webster introduced the resolutions calling for contributions of money and supplies:

The occasion is quite a new one. A famine, bringing want and distress on a great portion of a whole people, is unprecedented in Christendom in this age. The calamities of Ireland have been heard and read throughout the country, and have touched all American hearts. New improvements in communication have brought nations into nearer neighborhood with each other, and we hear the cries of suffering Ireland almost as fresh and as strong as if they had come from a part of our own country. In this land of abundance, we know nothing, by our own experience, of famine; and can hardly conceive of people dying, in families and by groups, through mere want of food. No heart can be so hard as not to melt at the details, apparently authentic, of the shocking distress existing in some parts of Ireland. It is a fit time for the activity and exertion of a national charity, and the flying moment should not be lost. While the ministrations of mercy are as beneficient as those of angels, let us render them, as far as we can, as swift also in carrying relief and consolation. Our object is not ostentation or parade. It is not to utter the sounds of empty brass or tinkling cymbals, but to do a deed of effectual charity, and do it promptly, that the objects of our compassion may bear tidings of kindness and of relief from across the ocean before death shall terminate their sufferings (p. 32, Feb. 9, 1847).

Turning over a few pages, one finds that the *Intelligencer* was

keenly interested in Father Mathew's visit to Washington (Dec. 18, 1849) and his extensive tour of American cities. A few days later, Father Mathew wrote from Richmond a characteristic letter of exaggerated gratitude and a pointed appreciation of American democracy:

> The happiest moments of my life were passed in Washington, and are to be forever memorable for the high honor conferred on me by your illustrious House of Representatives and Senate. Your great and good President, too, complimented me more than I could even hope for, by allowing me the privilege of dining at his table, and, what I prize much more, by treating me as a friend.
>
> But amidst all the splendors of Washington, not excepting that perfect model of architecture, the thrice majestic Capitol, the most sublime spectacle I beheld was the President of this glorious and mighty country, unattended and alone, in your public streets, in the true Republican simplicity of the olden times (p. 63).

Miss Spaulding has gathered together a wealth of material concerning duelling in the field of Bladensburg which she rightly urges should be preserved as a federal park. Among the more noteworthy duels may be listed the conflicts between Congressmen Gardenier of New York and Campbell of Tennessee (1808), the vicious encounter when Col. Flournoy of Jackson's army (1831) wounded his man, the killing of Ensign Edward Hopkins (1814) which produced an army order against the practice, the killing of ex-Senator Mason of Virginia by his cousin Col. John McCarthy (1819), the nation-arousing death of Decatur at the hands of Commodore Barron (1820) in the former's fifth duel, the semi-comic encounter between Henry Clay and the irascible John Randolph of Roanoke (1826), the wounding of ex-Congressman Richard Cooke of Virginia by the pugnacious Henry A. Wise (1831), the bloodless struggle between Congressmen Bynum of North Carolina and Jenifer of Maryland (1836), the murder of Francis Scott Key's son at the hands of another young midshipman (1836), the death of Congressman Graves of Kentucky at the hands of Representative Cilley of Maine in the shadow of the capitol (1838), the bloodless affray between Yancy of Alabama and Senator Clingman of North Carolina (1845), and the bloodless affair between Baron Kusserow of the Prussian embassy and General Laurence our representative at Costa Rica for whose resignation Secretary Seward asked immediately (1868). Bladensburg was a famous spot in those days and its secluded hollow was reddened by the blood of many men

especially those in military and naval service. But happily the dueling field was to pass into oblivion as state and federal laws prohibited these so-called conflicts of honor, as Congressmen learned to give and take in political debates, and as an aroused public conscience condemned the ancient practice as murderous.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

The New Germany. By ERNST JAECKH. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1927. $2.00.)

Considering the general interest which a topic like this meets nowadays, it may not be amiss to deal with the above book at some length. The book should be welcome as a brief exposition of the spirit that is permeating Germany today, but in common with some others of its type it apparently glorifies the present too much at the expense of the past. The past was not all darkness as Jaeckh tries to make it appear, even if the present means beautiful sunshine. Jaeckh undoubtedly exaggerates when he thinks the World War was merely an outward expression of an inward upheaval representing "a tremendous break in the ordinary course of the history of mankind, a metamorphosis such as has occurred only once before, namely, in the break between the ancient times and Christianity". To him the new order means a new birth, a new rhythm not only for a new Germany but also for a new world. According to him no nation was spiritually struck so hard, so deeply, so overwhelmingly by the war as Germany. The past was guided by a policy of might, the new Germany emerges into the policy of right!

Such phrases as these used by Jaeckh are familiar to all who know the World War and its propaganda. They are only partly correct, they magnify evolution into revolution, they mix fiction and truth; they overstate and overestimate the case, and they are especially unbecoming to Dr. Jaeckh who once prided himself to be part and parcel of the very system in Germany which he now condemns. The emperor often called him into his presence, took a walk with him and asked for his counsel and advice. I wonder if Jaeckh lectured the emperor then as he does, indirectly now, in this book. Then there was only one attraction for Jaeckh: the Kaiser. After everything collapsed he turned against the very institutions which were once so dear to his heart.

The old constitution was not all that it was reputed to be; that has since been freely conceded with special reference to the alleged autocracy of the emperor even by the *New York Times*. And long before the war a competent scholar and writer on constitutional law, John W. Burgess, an American, in his book the *German Emperor and the German Government* (page 18), said regarding the German constitution, to quote but one authority:

> If I should designate the entire political fabric organized by the constitution of the German empire as 'the United States of Germany', I would give the American mind a much clearer and truer conception of it than the title 'German empire' conveys. It is a federal or dual system of government . . . which contains a process for its own amendment fully as easy of application as our own. The constitution provides a central government of enumerated powers consisting of a legislature, the members of the lower house of which are chosen by the suffrage of all male citizens over twenty-five years of age and those of the upper house by the States of the Union, and of a President of the Union who . . . in his capacity of President of the Union is entitled 'German Emperor'. It reserves all other powers of government not expressly or implicitly vested in the central government to the States of the Union, gives the Emperor no general veto power over legislative acts. . . . The German political system is thus in principle the counterpart of our own. . . . The difference between the German system of government and our own in fundamental principle is thus really reduced to the one point of the difference in the executive tenure.

The real trouble in the past was that the German people were politically immature. Of course there is no reason to praise the Bismarck constitution as ideal. But Jaeckh is manifestly unjust when he refers to this constitution only as it worked out in war time—when even in the United States during the war the normal functioning of the Constitution was interrupted or suspended. The Reichstag, and not the Kaiser was the institution without which nothing could be accomplished. The Kaiser and his entourage was practically only so much "window dressing". The Reichstag granted or rejected the money necessary to carry on the business of government in peace or war and acted deliberately and without coercion. The cabinet had to please the Reichstag then as now, or it had to go. The Reichstag made and unmade the chancellor and the government. All propositions of the government had to be accepted by the Reichstag; the budget provided for all expenses. The Reichstag was often niggardly enough, indeed, for a far sighted policy of the government. There was no army under one single control, there was no federal army;

the government could suggest the size of the army but not create one. But enough. The old German constitution certainly had its serious shortcomings, but as such it was not much worse than others. Not the constitution was at fault nor a military mentality of Germany's leaders but the mentality of voluntary subordination on the part of the German people. Had Jaeckh restricted himself to this, the mind of the subject classes in the past and in the present, he could have made no mistake.

The book reprints three lectures delivered at Geneva in July 1926, two months before the entry of Germany into the League of Nations. Completed and brought up to January 1927 it contains, unfortunately, nothing about the economic history of Germany since the war, so desirable and welcome to readers outside of Germany; nothing on the school question, religious and social conditions, philosophic tendencies, the new spirit in literature, art, architecture, and press, if such a spirit exists it deals only with the new *political* Germany. The expression "Prussian Militarism" used by Jaeckh only in the sense of a Prussian political influence dominating within the German federation of states, but not in the familiar sense of alleged military armaments in Germany being more extensive than those of other powers, or in the sense of the German General Staff having provoked the war, is quite misleading. This first mentioned kind of "militarism" is as strong in Germany today as it was before the war, as Jaeckh himself emphasizes when he says (page 45): "The new Prussia is the corner-stone of the German republic, as the old Prussia was that of the military monarchy."

The following observation of Jaeckh may be interesting although it is highly controversial: The real political revolution in Germany occurred not in November, 1918, but in October, 1918; it expressed the revolt of the civil power, represented by the Chancellor, Prince Max von Baden, against "Prussian militarism." The Chancellor proclaimed a new German constitution establishing a democratic parliamentary monarchy in the place of a bureaucratic militaristic monarchy, with a constitution modelled on the English system, balancing monarchy and democracy against the supremacy of "Prussian militarism". This new constitution was approved by the Emperor and passed by the Reichstag; it involved a revolution in the government of Germany. Both Emperor and Chancellor, at the very beginning of the war, had recognized the necessity for a new order of things in

government. But again and again in their attempts at reform they both suffered shipwreck on the rock of "Prussian militarism". But this October revolution from *above* came too late. The November revolution from *below* broke out, partly as one phase of development from the October revolution from above. What happened? In October, 1918, the admiralty prepared an attack of the German fleet against the British fleet without cognizance of the political chancellor and in spite of the new constitution, indeed, intentionally in opposition to this new order. It was a *political* rebellion of the *admiralty* against the new constitution which had made the Chancellor the chief of the admiralty also. Several sailors, socialistically and democratically inclined, recognized the state of affairs. They heard and knew of the attitude of the officers in opposition to the new democratic constitution, in opposition to the People's Government. So the sailors demonstrated and rebelled in favor of the new democratic constitution against the admiralty. They were ready to defend Germany but not to attack Great Britain at a time when the political chancellor asked for peace and armistice. Together with other causes and reasons that, in the opinion of Jaeckh was the decisive signal for, and the beginning of, the revolution of November, 1918. (According to others, the sailors in Kiel, sick and tired of war, rebelled only after they had seen English warships hiss the red flag as a ruse of war!) According to Jaeckh the revolution was an uprising of the old spirit against the growing power of the new; the marine officers were the actual rebels; the marines, the sailors, were not rebellious! The "rebellion of the officers" of the navy was in Jaeckh's mind a demonstration against the new constitution! It was a last, weak struggle of a dying system that had long suffered from senility, that had outlived its strength; it dissolved in a night, died without a real death struggle like an oil lamp that goes out for lack of oil. The revolution, as Jaeckh says, was rather negative, the outcome rather of disgust than of enthusiasm; it resulted from political as well as military discouragement on the part of the old leaders.

All this is apparently only true in part. The end came as a surprise to most Germans, to the generals and to the admiralty as well as to the people, the socialists and bourgeois. The oil lamp did go out because of lack of oil, save in the material sense, not because the political system was dying from lack of strength. There was no more man power, no more young blood to withstand the onslaughts of the well-fed, solid and ambitious American army; there was no more

food to nourish the soldiers at the front and the people at home; there were no more war supplies, tanks and other equipment, to oppose the abundance of the new-comer from across the sea. Not the military front alone broke down, the "home front" collapsed as well, at the same time; both phenomena are closely interrelated, as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the military blame the civilians and the civilians blame the military. Jaeckh belongs to the latter class, the civilians. His book is not as objective as might be expected from a professional historian. Jaeckh is, however, not an historian and not a recognized authority on constitutional law. He is a partisan. Passioned love for the new order dictates his pen.

But what he says about the new Germany, when not contrasting it to the old one just gone, is true and worth knowing. The young Germany of the new democracy represents, after all, really an ultimate victory of the democratic south of Germany and of democratic tendencies in Europe over the feudal Prussian north. A *social* evolution has taken place. The French Revolution of 1830 and of 1848 extended into Germany. The Government of Baden in 1848 demanded from the Federal Council in Frankfort the election of a German National Parliament and succeeded. Six hundred elected members worked out a new democratic constitution, a parliamentary monarchy with the King of Prussia as "Emperor of Germany". Many of the members desired a republic. The Prussian King declined the imperial crown; he wanted it to come from the princes directly, not from the people. Nothing, therefore, came of this attempt of 1848 at establishing a "liberal" constitution. The constitution of 1870 realized only in part the dreams and aspirations of the people's parliament of 1848. The present "Weimar" constitution, however, consciously goes back to 1848. "Weimar" and "Frankfort" belong together. Between both lie sociologically the rise and growth of the fourth estate, the laboring class; and politically the exclusion of Austria from the German Confederation, not accomplished even now. This road appears, historically, to have been necessary.

A comparison between the Bismarck constitution and the Weimar constitution with reference to the realization of social and democratic ideals will unquestionably favor the latter. It is true, the Bismarck constitution was not what its enemies made of it; but it had no roots in the people; there was no soul in it; it had in the course of forty years outlived a generation, it had not kept pace with the demands and progress of a large class of the people. "Even good government

is no substitute for self-government," Jaeckh says, on page 60, correctly. Jaeckh describes, in detail, the many advantages of the present constitution over the old one, *e. g.*, with regard to the President, the Chancellor, the Parliament, the initiative of the people, the council of the Reich (Reichsrat), the new Federal Economic Council (Reichswirtschaftsrat), the parties and their conditions, the rights and advantages of the individual citizen, the personality and statesmanship of Stresemann, the German Secretary of Foreign Affairs, the education of the people in responsibility, Hindenburg's political attitude, publications of the secret archives regarding the war, and finally the international convictions and aspirations of the new Germany, its ideology of Right.

The people rule through the Diet alone. The present party life corresponds to the historical development of Germany. It is natural and healthy; it groups itself about a center in form of a "Little Coalition," or sometimes the "Great Coalition" and at other times the "Weimar Coalition". In January, 1927, the monarchists, that is the German nationalists, had recognized the new constitution as a reality, and had brought about a new coalition of the conservative "right wing" of the Reichstag with the center. The German People's Party, under Stresemann, also recognized the republic, which in the meantime received through Dawes an economic guarantee of existence. Ebert won over the radical left wing; Hindenburg, the "right" conservative element for the new state. The latter counseled the Emperor in 1918 to leave Germany; he offered the "rebel" Ebert his services, and advised Erzberger to accept the conditions of the armistice; he upheld the honor of Rathenau; he changed to civil dress, surrounded himself with advisors of the new spirit, praised Ebert as a patriot, and reconciled himself to the new spirit of the times. He realizes that things had to come that way, and that the old monarchy is an anachronism. Prince Ruprecht, of Bavaria, also admits this; furthermore, generals, such as Seeckt, Deimling, Schoenaich, Montgelas, and also diplomats and learned men recognized the same.

Jaeckh remarks also that the new Germany is not a politically unschooled nation. Contrary to other nations, eighty per cent. of the people vote at the national and other elections. Men of the people, like Severing, Marx, Wirth, Braun, Stresemann, Schacht, Simons, Preuss, Hindenburg, Loebe, Becker, Drews, Meissner, Meinecke, Delbrueck, Troeltsch, Schuecking, Bonn, and many women are the

political leaders. People who in the past would not have gained such importance are now directing affairs politically and nationally. The "subject" citizen in Germany has disappeared. The Crown Prince, and, later on, Emperor Frederick, referred to Bismarck's Germany as "an artificial chaos"; Gerhart Hauptmann announced in 1913, in a drama that was suppressed in the old régime, the new Democratic gospel. Schiller, Kant, Fichte, and especially the men of 1848, ultimately belong to this school of political philosophy. Even Nietzsche, that much misunderstood character, is a political pacifist. The German mediaeval constitution also was democratic. Present-day German education teaches thoughts of peace and democracy. Bethmann-Hollweg was an opponent of the old militaristic ideas of the "Junkers". His administration was the first which (in 1916) accepted the League of Nations idea after Wilson had announced it. The German foreign office worked out for itself a League of Nations plan (with Simons, Gaus, and Schuecking) which was more democratic than the present League of Nations. It is Germany, the New Germany, that is responsible for Locarno. Weimar, Geneva, these, according to Jaeckh, represent a chapter in the world's history that can be compared only with the break between antiquity and Christianity. Today Germany finally can say officially that war is a crime. The New Germany will, in the League of Nations, realize Wilson's "Fourteen Points". Rapallo was the first actual peace pact. New international relations in the new spirit are being formed; European interests are in the new Germany preferred to purely national interests. A disarmament of spirit is the slogan of the new times, and the New Germany will yet reconstruct the world, as it has finally found and reformed itself since the years 1917 and 1918.

That in brief is the trend of thought of the author, which is also apparent in his other writings. The old Germany, considered all in all, comes off, as I said, with a rather shabby deal. Jaeckh is an incurable optimist and shares this peculiarity with the majority of his party adherents. But aside from this, his book is pleasant reading; it remains generally reasonable in tone. Concerning the events of 1918, men will argue forever. What would have happened, no one really knows. Jaeckh freely admits that the unification of Germany needed the iron grasp of Bismarck; but, thank God, Ebert and Hindenburg have saved this union from chaotic disruption. The danger of a relapse into the old particularism is not yet entirely past. That very exaggerated local worship of tribal origin and tribal history, the

excessive affection for the local home instead of affection for the entire German commonwealth conceals dangers for Germany as a nation. Germany in its entirety should be constantly kept in mind by the Germans until finally Austria can unite herself to the old common German federation. The ideal has not yet been attained. But the New Germany is certainly on the road to the ultimate realization of this ideal also. It may be added, too, that the Catholic Church fares immeasurably better under the new constitution than under the old. Prominent Catholics like Mausbach, Herold, Beyerle and others helped considerably in framing it. The new constitution is more Christian than the old in spite of the many socialists who were principally instrumental in calling together the constitutional national assembly in Weimar. Beyerle says: "Never before have the wishes of the Catholic people of Germany been realized as much as in the present constitution. In no constitution has there been said as much regarding service to God as in the Weimar constitution." God bless it.

P. G. Gleis.

MINOR NOTICES

The Book of the Saints of the Ethiopian Church: Translation of the Ethiopic Synaxarium, Mashafa Senkesar. By Sir E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. Four volumes. (Cambridge, University Press, 1928.) The Synaxarium is a collection of lives of the Saints, one for each day of the year, written originally in Greek and Syriac, and later, with many legendary additions, rendered into Coptic for the use of the Egyptian Church. After the Mohammedan conquest, Arabic gradually became the prevalent language of the people of Egypt and the Lives of the Saints were translated into that language. It is from this last compilation that the Ethiopic Senkesar was translated. The Ethiopic text has been partly published with translation in Graffin's *Patrologia Orientalis,* by Guidi, Desnoyers, and Grébaut. The Arabic text itself with a Latin translation has been published in its entirety by J. Forget, of Louvain, in the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* 1916-1926. The publication of Sir Wallis Budge consists only of the English translation, without the text. The translation was made from the Ethiopic Manuscript, No. 660-661, of the British Museum, after the translator had examined practically all the ancient codices.

Sir Wallis Budge is so well known for his scholarship by his numerous publications in Egyptian, Coptic and Ethiopic that he needs no introduction nor recommendation. His purpose has been to give a translation as literal as possible. He has carried that purpose systematically throughout his work even to the point of exaggeration. Occasionally, at least for one who is not acquainted with the Ethiopic syntax, the meaning is somewhat obscure. He has simply transliterated proper names; this has its advantages, but when the identification is certain, why not use the English equivalent and write, *v. g.,* "Sorya" for "Syria"? This method may lead to positive misunderstandings: *v. g.,* "Romya" means not Rome but Greece and the Byzantine Empire. Finally, we regret that Sir Wallis Budge should not have given us the benefit of his extensive knowledge and pointed out for us, occasionally at least, the source of the folklore and legendary additions made to the original text; surely nobody could have done it as well as he, as we know from the few pages devoted to this phase in his Introduction. We do not mean this as a criticism, for the translator has done what he had set out to do and these are merely

details that do not detract from the value of the splendid work done; but we feel a sense of loss, when it would have been apparently easy for a scholar like Sir Wallis Budge to supply the desired information.

R. BUTIN, S. M.

Geschichte und Kirchengeschichte an den deutschen Universitäten. By EMIL CLEMONS SCHERER. (Freiburg, 1927.) Historians and particularly teachers of Church history will welcome this scholarly work. As the author himself mentions he intended at first to confine his efforts to the beginnings of the study of Church history at the Catholic theological faculties of Germany and Austria. In view of the fact, however, that the study of Church history for a long time was developing in closest union with the study of profane history; furthermore, due to the circumstance that the inauguration of lectures on universal history at the German Catholic universities in the second and third decades of the eighteenth century is to be considered not a beginning, but rather a resumption, the author deemed it necessary to open his research with the earliest study of universal history. As a consequence, Scherer attempts to offer a coherent presentation of the study of profane and ecclesiastical history, from its inception up to the period when the two branches of history were developed into independent academic branches of study. The author investigates the history of not less than forty universities. It is Scherer's chief aim and purpose to present the external development of historical study at German universities in the course of three centuries.

The introduction deals with the foundation of the first German universities, their character and arrangement and their attitude to the study of history. The main part of the work has a threefold division. Part one treats of the beginnings and first development of historical studies, from the time of Humanism up to 1648. In the first chapter of the first part the study of the ancient historians and the development into the study of universal history up to the death of Melanchton (1560) are discussed; the second chapter takes up the gradual introduction of the study of universal history (1560-1648).

In the second part the study of history at the Protestant universities, from 1648 to 1734, is investigated. While the first chapter of Part II goes into the development of profane history and its

inner differentiation, the second chapter takes up the development of Church history into an independent theological branch of study, from 1648 to 1734.

In the third part the author discusses Church history as a theological branch of study at the Catholic universities up to the beginning of the 19th century. The first chapter deals with the institution of chairs of universal history at the Catholic universities (1716-1752); in the second chapter is taken up the separation of Church history from profane history as a consequence of the Theresian study reform (1752-1773). The third chapter treats of the elevation of Church history to an independent theological branch of study (1773 to about 1800).

The author presents in the appendix a systematic collection of the quoted manuals of history and Church history from the beginning up to 1734, respectively to 1800. We find in Scherer's work also a list of archives and manuscripts used, and a very extensive bibliography as well as a good index.

L. B.

History of England. By W. E. LUNT, Professor of History in Harverford College. (New York and London, Harper, pp. xvi, 900, $4.50.) The writing of a college textbook is at best a rather delicate task. The author must produce a clear, concise, yet thorough compendium of his subject, viewed from many different angles. When the subject is the complete history of a nation it requires that the writer sift thoroughly the mass of literature on his subject. Not only the salient points but their settings, the spirit of the times and the events which dictated the spirit must be pressed into one compact whole so that every last item becomes an integral part of the finished product. In this work Professor Lunt has done all this, and moreover clothed his production in a very excellent literary style without sacrificing one whit of its historical value.

The disposition of topics and arrangement of chapters are excellent. There are 818 pages in the main body of the work, divided into forty chapters. Of these, four chapters and eighty-three pages are devoted to the period before the Conquest, the last chapter (twenty pages) treating of the Anglo-Saxon institutions, religious, political, social, literary. This is about the proportion observed throughout. Two hundred pages and nine chapters cover Norman and Plantagenet times (the true Middle Ages) from the Conquest to

the accession of the Tudors; twelve chapters and two hundred and twenty pages, almost equally divided, are given to Tudor and Stuart times, embracing the all-important periods of the Reformation and Civil Wars. The remaining portion of the work is devoted to the modern period of Hanoverian Monarchs and Cabinet government. In many respects this last is the best section of the entire book, for the superb way in which the author has portrayed the rise of the Cabinet and its development and activities throughout the last two centuries, and particularly in the Victorian era, stands out as the crowning achievement among many excellent feats accomplished by him in the course of one work.

It is a conservative, reserved history. Facts are presented with the barest suggestion of interpretation. Judgments are few and they are given reservedly and, it seems almost reluctantly. The attitude toward the Church is as fair as can be expected from one not of the Faith. In the chapter on Protestant and Catholic very little is said bearing on the title, and nothing at all of a controversial nature. The respective policies of Somerset and Northumberland are explained briefly, and the restoration under Mary with the reaction under Elizabeth are recounted. Mary is reprehended for her imprudence, but very mildly, and is given credit for her unquestioned sincerity. Elizabeth's good qualities as a ruler are given without adornment; her faults without excuse. Henry VIII and Cromwell are reservedly set forth as they appeared, with a suggestion of apology, but without any attempt at "white-washing".

An excellent manual of history, well written and without the slightest trace of propaganda; supplemented by several maps, genelogical tables and rosters of kings and ministers, and finally by an exhaustive and invaluable list of suggestions for further reading arranged by chapters, in which the list of works bearing on every chapter of the book is given, and the whole finished with an orderly index at the end, we have here a textbook which is worthy of the highest praise and should meet the success which is its due.

T. R. S.

Catholic Emancipation. Edited by Rev. HERBERT THURSTON, S. J. (London, Catholic Truth Society, 1928, pp. 112.) Preparatory to the centenary celebration of Catholic emancipation in Great Britain and Ireland, many books and pamphlets are being supplied for the

purpose of describing the history of this glorious movement, which triumphed with the act of April 13, 1829. Not the least of these endeavors is this collection of four pamphlets. The participants in, as well as the observers of, the coming celebrations, whether at Dublin in June or at London in September, will find this little work of great assistance primarily because of its solid historical character, but also because of the concise and precise presentation of its subject.

In its scope, it is intended to cover the period of one hundred and forty years between 1700 and 1840. The series is introduced by the editor, who is followed by a consideration of, "What England Owed to France" by Cecil Kerr, which covers the same period, under a different aspect, as that treated of by Denis Gwynn in, "The Dawning of Catholic Emancipation". "Emancipation Realised", by Rev. Phillip Hughes, concludes the collection. The period which Father Thurston has so ably synopsised may be termed the period of commercialized bigotry. This is indeed a sad chapter of English history: a time when a waning persecution of blood was supplanted by a relentless one of fines, imprisonment and banishment. It sheathed the sword of the executioner only to open the purses of informers, renegades and traitors. While there were, as quite often happens during persecutions, many cases of ignoble desertion, yet the spirit most general to the Catholics of those times and which met successfully the hatred of a misguided government, was one of charity and perseverance.

Cecil Kerr admits that to determine exactly just what England owed to France, by the presence of the latter's refugee priests, is quite difficult. Nevertheless his description should enable the memory of these heroic men to capture the hearts of Englishmen to-day as they themselves did over a hundred years ago. To depict the gradual dawning of emancipation and the glorious part played in it by Ireland is the task so well fulfilled by Denis Gwynn. He describes the period between the Relief Act of 1791 and the years of uncompromising agitation which immediately preceded that of 1829. He tells of the treachery of Pitt, but at the same time he shows the noble stand taken by Archbishop Milner, together with the Irish hierarchy, on the Veto Question. Rev. Philip Hughes, in treating of the final stage leading to emancipation and the years immediately following it, agrees with Archbishop Ward in saying that since 1800 the question was an Irish one. He sums up the important part

played by Daniel O'Connell when he calls him "Organizer of Victory". It was the peaceful agitation carried on by his Catholic Association which wrung from an unwilling Parliament and a bigoted king the long-coveted prize of Catholic liberties. M. M. N.

Stephen Langton, being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1927. By F. M. POWICKE, Fellow of the British Academy, Professor of Medieval History in the University of Manchester. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928, pp. viii, 227.) This is a scholarly biography of a man whose name is written boldly across the pages of English history. His fame undoubtedly rests on his connection with the Great Charter, the exaggerated implications of which have given its prime mover a prominence unwarranted by our knowledge of the man himself or of his character. Of the greater part of his life little can be known with certainty. The work of his only contemporary biographer, Matthew Paris, is lost, and modern biographers have heretofore been content with the briefest outlines of his career.

Aside from a few new conclusions and a detailed restatement of his public career, the chief importance of this work consists in the elaboration of a comprehensive estimate of Langton's character, a more correct appreciation of his rôle in the ecclesiastical and political crises of his time, a brief introduction to his writings, and the institution of a thorough study of his Scriptural commentaries and *Questiones.* Langton was a Biblical scholar of some repute, but he is perhaps best remembered for his division of the books of the Bible into the chapters now in universal use. Unfortunately the author has been able to consider the Paris doctor's theological and moral teachings solely in relation to their practical aspects. In this his purpose was to demonstrate the close connection between academic discussion and the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Indeed the evidence adduced seems to warrant a wider conclusion, for since the apparatus of civil government was largely in the hands of ecclesiastics trained in the schools, academic influence is also apparent in political administration. Certainly the evidence is clear in Langton's case.

Another question of supreme importance, herein proposed, is the relation between ecclesiastical reorganization under Langton's administration and the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council. In his *Dominican Order and Convocation,* Ernest Barker treats of one aspect

of this question, but historians generally have overlooked the fact that what was effected in England was by no means insular in design. Well might Dr. Powicke say: "If the action taken . . . by Langton and the English clergy had become general, if the principle of representation had become, not merely a principle of local organization, but one of the marks of a united and universal Church, history might indeed have been changed."

Among the valuable appendices we must note those describing the extant MSS. of Langton's writings. The tentative conclusions proposed by the author concerning the personnel of the opposition to King John and the motives animating them are worthy of respectful hearing.

J. B. W.

William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin. By Rt. Rev. P. J. WALSH, M. A. (Dublin, Talbot Press, 1928, pp. xvi, 612.) The archiepiscopal see of Dublin was, by its very position, during the English domination, the most important ecclesiastical post in Ireland. It was like a watchtower with a window overlooking the Pale and a door leading to the rest of the country. Because of this fact the biography of Archbishop Walsh, who held this metropolitan see for the last thirty years of English rule, necessarily touches the major political and religious questions that engage the country during that period. In this work the author has given us the Archbishop almost entirely in his public relations, with the promise of a future book on his purely pastoral labors.

After a brilliant theological course, William J. Walsh rapidly passed from professor to vice-president to president of his alma mater, Maynooth. Holding the last named position at the death of Cardinal McCabe, and having distinguished himself as an expert in canon law during the famous O'Keefe case, he was by far the most popular candidate of the diocesan clergy for the vacant see. That the English government did not see him in so favorable a light, because of his staunch Nationalist tendencies, and tried by every method of backstair diplomacy to discredit him at the Vatican, is very well brought out.

Rome, however, decided in his favor and from 1885 until a few years before his death he was in the thick of all matters of importance to Ireland. The agrarian question, home rule, the unfortunate Parnell affair, and equality of educational opportunities for Catholics were but some of the questions with which he was engaged.

Able and logical in his presentation of problems, his advice was sought continually by government officials, members of Parliament and his brother bishops. He was in constant communication with Cardinal Manning until the latter's death, and between them they did much to further the cause of the Church and people in Ireland.

Archbishop Walsh did not live to see the peaceful working of the Irish Free State and although favorable to Sinn Fein, his age and infirmity kept him from actively participating in the later phases of Irish politics. The work is almost autobiographical, being principally composed of the letters and public utterances of the Archbishop, the author contenting himself, for the most part, with connecting these and giving information necessary for a proper understanding of the matter treated. The book is well documented, possesses a comprehensive index, and is a welcome addition to the number of nineteenth century episcopal biographies that have appeared during the last few years.

C. M. R.

Father Reginald Buckler, O. P. 1840-1927. By C. M. ANTONY. (London, Sheed and Ward, 1927, pp. ix, 155.) It is hardly possible to read this book without feeling the eager, pulsing, spiritual romance that filled the eighty-seven years of this saintly Dominican's life. Such a striking personality and so rare a character we meet but seldom, for Father Buckler had the soul of an artist, the intellect of a scholar, the traits of a mystic, and the heart of an apostle. It was the latter that urged him in his seventy-first year to leave England and all that he held dear and accept the labors of a foreign missionary on the Island of Grenada in the West Indies. Miss Antony gives us intimate glimpses of this great soul and delineates his exceptional character chiefly through Father Buckler's own letters. Thus in the chapter "Dear Hugh" we see the tender affection that grew up and matured between Father Reginald and his convert, Robert Hugh Benson. The extracts of his letters to religious show the workings of a practical mystic, lofty in ideals, loving and compassionate, yet sensible in execution. A product of the contemplative and active life, a deep student of St. Thomas, Father Reginald gave to others the fruits of his contemplation. His *Perfection of Man through Charity* is nothing more than St. Thomas's tract *De Caritate* put in workable form. So, too, his other writings. Nothing less than a larger and more complete biography will satisfy the reader of these

brief memoirs. Hardly had Father Buckler died when Miss Antony, who knew him so well, laid this appreciative wreath on his grave. We hope that her capable pen will give us a more enduring monument befitting this grand "old Father of Grenada". C. M. D.

A Life of Cardinal Mercier. By MONSIGNOR A. LAVEILLE; Translated by ARTHUR LIVINGSTONE. (New York and London, the Century Company.) Mgr. Laveille, apostolic protonotary and vicar general of Meaux, who died quite recently, was a very charming and prolific writer, who excelled in hagiographical literature. The greater number of his works ran to six, eight, and even twelve editions, while three of them were crowned by the French Academy. Of the present work in its French dress no less than three thousand copies were sold in four weeks. In Cardinal Mercier the author had a subject entirely after his own heart, and those brief but luminous chapters which tell of the Student, the Professor, the Organiser, the Archbishop and fighting Cardinal, and a World's Idol, give a clear and accurate portrait of this great scholar and churchman. The only criticism which I would venture to make of Mgr. Laveille's book in the original is, that the author does not seem to have had much personal knowledge of his hero; and consequently, those little intimate touches, which help so largely to make a biography telling and appealing, are lacking.

With regard to the English version certain strictures must be passed. There is a hiatus from page 156 to page 173. Pages 173 to 188 occur twice. It would appear that the translator is not familiar with Catholic expressions or usages. On page 238 he makes the dying cardinal speak of "conducting holy mass myself", and "to conduct the holy liturgy of the mass". Of course, no Catholic would ever use such an outlandish expression. As a matter of fact the Cardinal's own words are: "Privé du bonheur de *celebrer* le saint sacrifice de la messe", and again, "*Celebrer* toujours la sainte liturgie de la messe". On page 57, Leo XIII is made to say: "I like that boy Mercier. He is a man". The opening sentence has a triviality about it, that jars with all we know of Leo XIII. I was then curious enough to turn up the passage in the French edition to see what exactly the Pope had said. "Je l'aime, ce bon Mercier. C'est un homme". "I am very fond of this worthy Mercier. He is a man". In the cases noted above only one word is mistranslated. But this word is a pivot-word, which determines the

whole sense and coloring of the sentence. The reviewer would be false to his duty if he failed to point out such blemishes.

WILLIAM P. H. KITCHIN.

Franciscan Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart 1865-1926. By MAOL-IOSA. (Peekskill, N. Y., Mount Saint Francis, 1927, pp. xii, 228.) This is a brief history of the Gray Nuns in the United States. Although the activities of these holy women extend to but three states of the union, the narration of their foundation and subsequent labors under the most trying circumstances should prove instructive to all interested in the progress of religion in the United States. The style is as simple and unpretentious as the lives and works described.

A brief outline of the origin of this branch of the glorious Franciscan family at Rome, and their approval by His Holiness, Pope Pius IX in 1858, introduced the reader to the Missionary Sisters. Then follows an account of the first foundation of the new sisterhood in the metropolis of the western world in the late fall of 1865. In New York seemingly unsurmountable difficulties were overcome and the new institution was an assured success.

As the community grew, the activities of these heroic souls expanded. Foundations were begun in the less populous parts of the Empire State. The missionary work of the sisters in Lewis County read like a chapter from the story of the beginnings of Christianity. Though their work was eminently successful it was acquired only by a self-sacrifice worthy of the Apostles. The chief occupations of the Missionary Sisters are teaching in schools and academies and the care of the poor and homeless.

For some time New York State alone had received the ministrations of the kindly sisters. Soon however, New Jersey and Pennsylvania witnessed the ceaseless and untiring efforts of the zealous sisters. In these two states flourishing communities now exist and carry on their work with no less zeal and energy than that which marked their foundations in New York.

Aside from its historical value the book affords the reader an intimate glimpse of how the spirit of St. Francis of Assisi still lives in an age so different from that of St. Francis, and in a land so distant from that which the saint of Umbria knew. The charity of St. Francis and his love for the poor are strikingly manifest in every work and enterprise of the Gray Nuns.

C. H. G.

Evangelized America. By GROVER CLOUD. (New York, The Dial Press, pp. xi, 373.) This is the story of revivalism in America. It is an analysis of the revival into its underlying motives and in a collective biography of the "Evangelists" from Jonathan Edwards down to Billy Sunday and Aimee Semple McPherson. Individualism, "economic, social and political," Mr. Cloud tells us, has made America "the peculiarly fertile field of Evangelism." The popularity of evangelism is attributed to the "ever welling yet constantly frustrated human impulse to escape," to the "highly individualized desire which brings men and women down the sawdust trail in the alluring hope of a vision into the beyond."

In regard to the evangelists, Mr. Cloud indicates how each started with his own conversion; how each made his conversion his call to preach and his principal theme; how over and over again each one tells of his personal regeneration. The sacerdotal strategy of the evangelist for the winning of souls is on the level of gross sensationalism or on the plane of finely wrought emotional appeal. Too, the evangelists of the past and present are to be distinguished by their motives; the thoughts of the first evangelizers of America were not of this world but of the future, while Billy Sunday and his imitators borrow from Barnum in drawing their cards and take a leaf from big business in selling salvation.

The course of Arminianism in New England, the Kentucky camp-meetings, the wanderings of the Mormon groups, the post-panic waves of repentance in 1857 and 1907, and the movements under Chapman and Moody, all are equally well done. The subject has been handled justly and without prejudice. The presentation is objective, with a full delineation of the facts and an interpretation of their effects, whether for good or evil, based upon the testimony of contemporary witnesses.

S. McG.

Men of Destiny. By WALTER LIPPMANN. Drawings by Rollin Kirby. (New York, Macmillan, 1927, pp. 244.) This is a collection of brilliant, cynical, pen pictures of such eminent Americans as Smith, Bryan, Coolidge, Mencken, Sinclair Lewis, Harding, McAdoo, House, and Mellon by Mr. Lippmann, one of America's small group of able, courageous, and liberal journalists. The character sketches are excellent. There is skilful analysis. There is no conventional portrait.

The reader may not agree with the portrayal; but his interest is challenged, for the sketches are fascinating.

Mr. Lippmann writing before the nomination of Mr. Smith saw the governor of New York as the first descendant of the "new immigrants" who was able to challenge the smug doctrine of American vaunted toleration: "As long as there was nobody in sight among the newer immigrant people who could seriously be considered for President, the fiction could persist that all careers were open to talent, and that a man was a man for all that. It was not necessary to inquire whether the fiction was seriously meant since there was nobody to challenge it." He sees millions of our half-enfranchised, tolerated Americans under Al Smith's leadership making "their first tangible bid for recognition". With prophetic vision, the writer recognized that Smith could not be called a radical for advocating the respectable reforms which Elihu Root had supported, that he could not be labelled a communist like La Follette, and that he could neither be damned as a pacifist or as an internationalist. He is damp and a Tammany man, but even the Tweed days were no worse than the era of the Philadelphia gas ring. His personal honesty could not be assailed. The Ku Kluxers "may talk about the Pope to the lunatic fringe", but the real conflict would lie in the unreasoning opposition of the rural areas and Babbitt-towns to the metropolitan culture of which Smith is a typically self-made product. The yokel likes to go to New York, but he dreads and fears the big city; and the fundamentalists, rubes, poor whites, the uneducated, and the unread are a great majority in this tolerant, democratic commonwealth. Lippmann accepts Smith's answer to Marshall as a refutation more sound and American than Mr. Marshall's open, questioning letter. Without hesitation he ventures that Catholics "are no longer, as they were a generation ago, largely confined to a class who do the menial work and do not have to be taken into account in the government of the country. They are a substantial and powerful part of the electorate, and few of them are in a mood to acquiesce under a concrete test in the unwritten law that they are second-class citizens who cannot aspire, no matter what their other qualification, to the highest office in the land."

Mr. Lippmann, finding no "blinding illumination" in C. Bascom Slemp's Coolidge in the *Mind of the President,* attempts to picture Coolidge as he sees him, a man whose "genius for inactivity is devel-

oped to a very high point", who has offered "a steady application to the task of neutralizing and thwarting political activity wherever there are signs of life", and as one who has a marvelous ability to "apply a wet blanket to an enthusiast". "At a time when Puritanism as a way of life is at its lowest ebb among the people, the people are delighted with a Puritan as their national symbol". With this one can agree, but not with the reference to national prosperity during this lethargic era. Few will disagree that the Eighteenth Amendment is an attempt to impose the moral ideas of the villages on the nation with the Anti-Saloon League the endowed enforcement arm of the evangelical churches and of the godly people.

Bryan is described as the apostle of the doctrine of majority rule. He never led a political majority, but at Dayton he represented a majority of the tax-payers who wanted their interpretation of the Genesis taught in the schools regardless of men of science. Turning to H. L. Mencken, democracy is made ridiculous by satire and consistent pounding at "Americana". Mencken does not argue, he attacks with ridicule and vituperation the sectaries, the Klan, the mob, the yokels, the fundamentalists, the "rotarians", and the other groups who compose our intellectually submerged four-fifths of the population. And Mencken is accepted as an infallible critic, because he does not underate himself in a land where men are accepted at their own rating.

Senator Borah is depicted as a free lance Republican without constructive ability but with an enormous capacity of aiding or injuring an administration. Mr. Lippmann enquires where did the ever-repeated idea originate that Mr. Mellon is the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since the days of Alexander Hamilton. Like Hamilton, he believes that the welfare of the country lies "in government by the rich, especially by rich manufacturers and creditors". "As a matter of fact Prohibition Enforcement under Mr. Mellon's titular leadership has been just what everybody knows it is: a dismal failure surrounded by foolish promises that nobody any longer believes". He demands the debt, but as a manufacturer he stands valiantly by the tariff which limits European ability to pay that debt. Coolidge's financial wisdom is summed up "they hired the money, didn't they?" And Mr. Lippmann ends his sketch with "Mr. Mellon is only a Pittsburgh millionaire".

This is indeed an interesting book. It was well to have salvaged these essays from the pages of the *New Republic, Yale Review,* and other journals in which they first appeared.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

The Bridge to France. By EDWARD N. HURLEY. (Philadelphia and London, J. P. Lippincott Company, 1927, pp. xiv, 338.) Diplomats and generals have written their memoirs but now comes a business man to tell how a war is carried on away from the green table and off the battlefield. Mr. Hurley was the wartime chairman of the United States Shipping Board, which made it possible for this country to aid the allies in holding back the German hosts by rushing more than two million men and supplies to the front in France. The undertaking even now staggers the imagination—two million men are two million men, and supplies for them, adequately and regularly moved, constitute in themselves a tremendous item. The allies could not move these men for they had lost over six million tons of shipping and the United States was not a maritime country. The board had to commandeer ships wherever it could and build, not leisurely but with all possible speed, for the allied lines in France were bending under the pressure of the German forces. Yet all this the Shipping Board accomplished under the management of the author of this book. How it was done he tells "as a business man and not as an author"—straightforward, without embellishment. Modestly he claims that some one else, "fifty years hence will be better able to write a history of the tremendous effort required to create the American Emergency Fleet and with far more confidence, authority and plausibility than is possible at the present time even for those of us who know the facts at first hand" (p. 46). We doubt it. This is a man's book. The chapters are short. Every one of them is to the point. When Mr. Hurley is through with a topic he is through with it. He did not know that Germany was not so reprehensible as many thought she was in 1917 and many will not know for years to come. His occasional utterances on this score can be overlooked; they are evidences of the honesty of the man, earmarks of the truth of the story he tells. Unquestionably Mr. Hurley's book is one of the most important memoirs of the World War age.

F. J. T.

An Outline for the Study of the History of Fine Arts, in Western Civilization from the Earliest Times to the End of the Seventeenth Century. By RALPH FANNING. (Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1928, pp. 164.) This outline is adapted for courses in the history of fine arts which are given at Ohio State University. The compiler defines the history of fine arts as a combination of the study of history and of those arts which give material expression to man's development and to his religious, political, and social life at any given time. Part I covers ancient art: Egyptian, Aegean or Prehellenic, Grecian (Homeric Age to Persian Wars, Persian Wars to Alexander, and Hellenistic period), and Roman. Under each section and subdivision are historical notes, suggested influences, contributions in way of painting, sculpture, and archictecture, examples, and a selected bibliography of available readings. Part II considers the Mediaeval Period with an ample classification of its arts, and examples of architecture on the Continent and in England. Part III is entitled Renaissance Art. The little volume deserves a wider welcome than that of a local class-room manual. It is well done. Travellers, club members, and cultural readers who would appreciate the cathedrals and art centers of Europe should find this outline of value as well as a starting point for an interesting course of study.

On the other hand, such a guide will annoy Klansmen and deep-dyed sectarians, for on careful examination they will find that a third of the book deals with the pagan period and the last two-thirds with the Catholic era. They will look in vain for the greatest painters and sculptors and for the rare cathedrals in the post-Reformation period. They will question the darkness of the Middle Ages despite infallible assurances from their press and pulpit. They will wonder if this is not a course in Catholic Church history. They will see a challenge to Nordic suppremacy. And they would worry far more if they were aware of the number of esthetic souls who have found their road to Rome by way of art galleries and the grand tour of mediaeval cathedrals.

R. J. P.

Romance of the Merit System: Forty-five Years' Reminiscences of the Civil Service. By MATTHEW F. HALLORAN. (Privately printed, Washington, 1928, pp. 314.) Students of government will welcome this volume of reminiscences, dealing with the Civil Service Commission by the contact representative, Mr. Halloran, who has been em-

ployed in the office of the commission since 1883. The present chairman of the commission, Mr. Deming, writes a foreword in which he hints that no one is better prepared than the author to write such a sketch. This the book amply demonstrates. Nowhere is there available such a mass of information concerning the old spoils system, the civil service reformers, the Pendleton Act, the administration of the merit system, and the contribution of the various commissioners with special emphasis on the work of Dorman B. Eaton and Theodore Roosevelt. The story of the civil servants is well told, and Mr. Halloran with commendable pride has compiled a huge list of former government clerks who have risen to higher federal positions or who have succeeded as Congressmen, lawyers, and business leaders. Full of the general subject, he has written interestingly as well as authoritatively about a branch of the government concerning which text-book writers have displayed too little information.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

With this issue a new board assumes editorial management of the *Review*. Because of ill-health, Dr. Browne has been forced, regretfully, to lay aside his work as managing editor, in which position he gave unsparingly of his time and experience to maintain high standards of editorial excellence. The last eight volumes will remain a worthy monument of his conscientious labors in the cause of Catholic history. Dr. Guilday, editor of the first six volumes, will again direct the policy of the *Review*, with Doctors Stratemeier and Stock as associates, and with the assistance of the Department of History of the Catholic University of America.

Dr. Guilday, secretary of the American Catholic Historical Association, is spending the latter part of his year of absence from the Catholic University in certain archival centres of Europe, gleaning materials for his forthcoming Life of Archbishop Hughes. Dr. Stock, president of the Association, has an exposition of the settlement of the Roman Question in the April issue of *Current History*.

The first number, March, of the *Journal of Modern History*, which was proposed at the Rochester meeting of the American Historical Association, 1926, has appeared in most pleasing garb. If the contents of this initial issue are to be its standard, the new publication will be certain to rank among the best of the historical journals. Its scope will be the history of Europe and its expansion from the Renaissance to the close of the World War. Readers of the *Review* will be interested in Ernest W. Nelson's evaluation of the Recent Literature concerning Erasmus, and in the excellent bibliography, of thirty-four pages, of books of consequence which appeared in European history in 1928. Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt is the managing editor; it is published by the University of Chicago Press, and the subscription price is four dollars per annum.

Of great value to scholars in the various fields of the social sciences will be the monthly publication, *Social Science Abstracts*, to be issued, beginning in March, under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council with F. Stuart Chapman as editor-in-chief. The purpose of the enterprise is "to provide brief summaries of new material as promptly as possible after publication and thus to help readers keep

abreast of the rapidly increasing output of new work." For the present only 15,000 abstracts a year are contemplated. These abstracts will be not mere summaries of known or readily accessible material but statements of "newly discovered or assembled information . . . new interpretations of known materials, new hypotheses or newly stated hypotheses . . . new techniques and methods of research . . . new criticisms of research procedures. . . ." The abstracts, too, will not be "reviews"; criticism or evaluation of an author's work are to be scrupulously avoided. All languages will be covered. Editorial offices have been provided by Columbia University, New York, at 611-613 Fayerweather Hall. The subscription rate is $6.00 a year and includes the annual index.

The January number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* contains the first instalment of Rev. Henry S. Spalding's Colonial Maryland; a further chapter of Joseph J. Thompson's Illinois: Cradle of Christianity and Civilization in Mid-America; an account of the First American Foreign Missioners, by Marian Habig, O.F.M.; the continuation of Anthony Matre's history of the American Federation of Catholic Societies; and a general article on the Introduction to American History, by Laurence J. Kenny, S. J.

The *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, for December, contains a study of the Catholic Church in the United States during the Civil War Period, by Robert J. Murphy; and a memoir, by Anne Easby-Smith, of Major-General St. Clair A. Mulholland, Patriot and Catholic.

The Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution has published its annual *List of Doctoral Dissertations Now in Progress at the Chief American Universities.* The following titles will be of interest to students of Church history: Early Christian Asceticism, M. M. Deems, Chicago; the Rivalry between the Secular and the Regular Clergy in the Middle Ages, Helen R. Bitterman, Chicago; Byzantine Hymnology, Marjorie Carpenter, Radcliffe; the Founding of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, Sister Francis Rita, Minnesota; the Relation of the Papacy to Learning in the Thirteenth Century, G. Post, Harvard; Academic Freedom in the Universities of the Thirteenth Century, Judith S. Bernstein, Columbia; Relation of the Universities to the Reformation, E. G. Schwiebert, Cornell; the Apprehension, Trial, and Punishment of Heretics in Medieval

England, J. R. Bacher, Pennsylvania; Popular Reaction to Religious Change in the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, R. K. Gearhart, Pennsylvania; John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion, J. M. Batten, Chicago; Historical Antecedents of Methodist Enthusiasm, Umphrey Lee, Columbia; Catholic Emancipation, G. D. Sanderson, Harvard; the Colleges of the University of Paris in the Middle Ages, E. F. Wilson, California; the History of the University of Toulouse in the Middle Ages, C. E. Smith, California; the Chancellors of the University of Paris in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, R. E. Keohane, California; the Papacy and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Louis O'Brien, Columbia; History of the Monastery of Subiaco to 1500, Geneva H. Drinkwater, Chicago; Influence of the Religious Movements on the Origin of the Milanese Commune, S. M. Brown, Columbia; Canonical Legislation in Visigothic Spain, A. K. Ziegler, Catholic; Secular Activities of the German Bishops during the Feudal Age, E. N. Johnson, Chicago; History of the University of Prague in the Middle Ages, L. Porter, California; Relations of the American Missionary Movement to American Diplomacy in China, A. S. Price, Harvard; the Statute of Mortmain and Its Effect in the United States, W. J. Doheny, C. S. C., Catholic; the Voice of the American Clergy in Time of War, M. C. Jacobs, Columbia; History of the Catholic Chaplain, Aidan Germain, O. S. B., Catholic; the Work of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in America, J. A. Griffin, Catholic; the Clerical Prelude to the American Revolution, E. A. Hartney, Yale; American Opinion of Roman Catholicism during the Revolution, Sister M. Augustina Ray, Columbia; Church and State in the United States, 1783-1790, R. C. Daily, Indiana; Catholic Missions among the Indians of the United States, 1790-1875, Sister M. Celeste Leger, Catholic; Attitude of the Churches toward the Civil War and Reconstruction, L. G. Vander Velde, Harvard; Career of the Right Rev. John Lancaster Spalding, Sister M. Evangeline Henthorne, Illinois; the Social Movement in Relation to the Programme of the American Churches, M. C. Latta, Ohio; the Church of England in British North America, 1774-1854, C. G. Pierson, Wisconsin; the Conversion of the Indians in New Spain, W. W. Barnes, Columbia.

J. P. Pritchett's account of the Origin of the So-Called Fenian Raid in Manitoba in 1871, which appears in the March issue of the *Canadian Historical Review*, attempts to show that the O'Donoghue

and O'Neill project was not Fenian in any form. Another well-prepared article in the same journal, by Norah Story, deals with the activities of Papineau in Exile, that is, after the latter and his trusty lieutenant, Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan, had made their way to Albany.

Professor Edward M. Earle, Columbia University, contributes to the April number of *Foreign Affairs,* a study of the American Missions in the Near East.

The last volume that has appeared in the *Records of Civilization,* Columbia University Press, 1928, is the *Two Cities, a Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A. D.,* by Otto, Bishop of Freising, translated in full, with introduction and notes by Dr. Charles C. Mierow, president of Colorado College. The translation is based upon the text by Hofmeister as published in *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1912). The Introduction lays the historical background of the work, gives a biographical sketch of Bishop Otto, and appraises the author's philosophy of history as well as his political and theological views. Nine volumes of this series, which is edited by Professor Austin P. Evans, under the auspices of the department of history of Columbia University, have so far appeared.

Among the contents of the *Camden Miscellany,* volume XV (third series, volume XLI), are: a Transcript of "The Red Book," a detailed account of Hereford bishopric estates in the thirteenth century, edited by A. T. Bannister, M. A., F. S. A.; Edward II, the Lords Ordainers, and Piers Gaveston's Jewels and Horses (1312-1313), edited by R. A. Roberts; and the Table of Canterbury Archbishopric Charters, transcribed and edited by Irene J. Churchill.

L'Église de France sous le Consulat et l'Empire, 1800-1814 (Paris, J. Gabalda et Fils, pp. xxix, 396), by Abbé G. Constant, is a scholarly treatment of such subjects as the Catholic situation in France during the Revolution, the Concordat of 1801, the rupture between Napoleon and Pius VII, and the Concordat of 1813.

A second edition of *La Verdad sobre Mexico,* by Nicolás Marín Negueruela has appeared (Barcelona, Tipografía Católica Casals, pp. 367).

The *Mélanges d'Archeologie et d'Histoire* (XLIV^e année), 1927, Fasc. I-V, a serial published by the École Française of Rome, contains an informing study based on new research of the earlier life of the well-known John Burckard, the papal master of ceremonies, whose Diary is one of the recognized sources of Italian Renaissance history (*Les Méfaits du Ceremoniaire Jean Burckard* par J. Lesellier).

Apropos of Catholic Emancipation, the centennial year of which is now at hand, the question of the oath imposed by James I on English Catholics and condemned by Cardinal Bellarmine and Paul V has lately provoked an interesting discussion. Dom Cuthbert Butler, author of the charming biography of Bishop Ullathorne, contends in the *Downside Review* (October, 1928) that in the controversy occasioned by this oath of 1606 James was more in the right than Bellarmine, and in support of his view he points out that the so-called Emancipation Oath of 1829, sanctioned by the English and Irish Bishops and substantially the same as the oath of 1606, "was at least tolerated as one permissible for Catholics to take". Father John Broderick S. J., against whose account of the Bellarmine-James dispute, in his recent biography of Blessed Bellarmine, Dom Butler raises objection, writes in defense of his position in the London *Month* (January, 1929). Incidentally, much light is thrown on Catholic teaching, past and present, regarding those one-time burning issues, the deposing and the indirect temporal power of the Popes.

The serious student of history will not neglect to become familiar with the series of superb encyclopedias or *Dictionnaires* now in course of publication in France under the editorship of Dom Cabrol, Dom LeClercq, Père D'Ales and other eminent Catholic scholars. The eighth volume of the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (Paris, 1928, pp. 1527) appeared in the course of last year. Not merely the professed archeologist or liturgist, but the classicist, the historian, and almost any type of scholar will find up to date and authoritative information at hand in this latest volume of the series. There are, for example, articles on the Latin Language, the Kouchakji (Antioch) chalice, Justinian, Athanasius Kircher, the Jesuit, and Godfroi Kurth. Dom LeClercq, who writes the article on the Antioch chalice, pronounces for its authenticity as certain while maintaining that it "would be imprudent to set this object back to a date anterior to the III century and perhaps even to the IV" (p. 853). The

sketch, running into thirty thousand words, of Kurth, the eminent Belgian historian (1847-1916) is particularly welcome. American readers have become familiar with his illuminating *The Church at the Turning Points of History,* perhaps the most popular of his works. It is to be regretted that an English rendering of Kurth's *Les Origines de la Civilization Moderne,* a comprehensive philosophic survey of the beginnings of the modern world, has not yet been given to the public.

The *American Historical Review* has recently made a plea for American support of the *Analecta Bollandiana,* the hagiographical review published by the Bollandists, the group of Belgian Jesuits working on that great monument of Catholic scholarship, the *Acta Sanctorum.* Very likely the average student or reader of history would be disposed to slight the *Analecta* as being too technical and restricted in scope to meet his needs in any practical way. As a matter of fact the book-notices alone, if not the *articles du fond,* will repay perusal by anyone working in the field of general history. The latest issue of the *Analecta* contains notices on numerous English books, for example, Van Dyke's *Ignatius Loyola,* Broderick's *Blessed Robert Bellarmine,* Martindale's *Vocation of St. Aloysius,* and F. M. Powickes' *Stephen Langton.* This last-named book is a timely one in view of the recent celebration of the seven hundredth anniversary of the death of the great English Cardinal. "A curious fact", writes the Bollandist reviewer of the Oxford professor's book, "is the existence of fragments of a Life of Stephen Langton written by Matthew of Paris and thoroughly in the style of the *Vies des Saints.* This publication of the *gesta* of a great ecclesiastic by an annalist of renown was a sort of first step towards canonization and Langton would not have missed by much of a margin receiving the honors of the altars if public attention under the influence, no doubt, of the University of Oxford, had not been directed toward another archbishop of Canterbury, St. Edmund Abingdon".

"Medieval studies have an ever increasing attraction for American savants and their pupils", writes Père de Ghellinck in his notice of Gray Cowan Boyce's *English-German Nation in the University of Paris During the Middle Ages* (Bruges, 1927) appearing in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Louvain), October, 1928. Mr. Boyce's thesis was begun in the University of California and finished

abroad after first-hand research in Paris, Ghent and Brussels. Much help, as might be expected, was afforded the author in his attempt to reconstruct medieval university life in Paris by the monumental *Auctarium* of Deniflé-Chatelin.

The January and February numbers of the *Catholic World* contain an article in two parts entitled *Jacopone da Todi* by Arrigo Levasti, a distinguished littérateur of Florence. This study marks a very interesting contribution to the very meagre material in the English language, on a celebrated mystic of the Thirteenth Century. The author, after giving a brief account of the highlights in Jacopone's career, institutes a comparison between St. Bonaventure and the poet. He then sketches the mystical profusions found in da Todi's poetry enhancing the value of the article with citations and translations. Levasti looks upon the subject of his study as seeming less profound as a mystic than such persons as Suso, Ruysbroeck, St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross.

Bulletin No. 5, October 1928, of the Catholic University of Peking, published by the Archabbey Press, Latrobe, Pa., contains among other contributions several articles of interest to Church history. The article entitled "The Monk Lu Cheng-Hsiang", by Alphonse Monestier, is an account of the career of His Excellency M. René Lu Cheng-Hsiang, ex-Prime Minister of China, who recently entered the Benedictine Order. "A Journey to Hsuan Hua Fu on occasion of the Consecration of Bishop Peter Ch'eng" gives an interesting account of an event that is significant of the progress of the Church in China. This article is by Dom Prior Ildephonse, O. S. B. Other historical studies in this issue are: "The Franciscan Contemporaries of Marco Polo" by Dom Francis Clougherty, O. S. B., and "China's Relations with the West from the Accession of Yao (2357 B. C.) to the End of the San Tai Period (249 B. C.), by Dom Charles Rauth, O. S. B.

The *Codex Juris Canonici,* in Canon 1279, regulates the approval of images to be exposed in churches for the veneration of the faithful. Doubtless the import of the Canon is to safeguard faith and morals in the exhibition of sacred art. Historical iconography ought also to be taken into account. There is no point to enshrining statues and pictures of saints lately canonized of whom true portraits exist, having the visage of the *Commune Sanctorum.* Again, the authentic attributes of the Saints should be given a careful study so as not to

portray the Saints in habiliment and symbolism that is unhistorical. An interest in a most fascinating portion of Church History, the hagiographical, will make for correctness in historic portrayal of the Saints without which the artistic sense of the beholder is apt at times to suffer a rude shock.

That a general and vital interest in the principles of Papal conciliation exists at the present day may be gathered from the publication from time to time in our secular magazines of lists of works on the subject. Titles of such works are: "Das Friedenswerk der Kirche in den Letzten drei Jahrhunderten," Berlin, 1927; "Las Relaciones entre México y el Vaticano," Mexico, 1928; "Le Vatican et la Paix," Paris, 1928; "Diagnose des Zeitalters," Weimar, 1928. The authors of these works are respectively, Joseph Mueller, Joaquin Ramirez Cabañas, Ernest Judet, and Richard Bie.

Historical articles in current periodicals: Deductive History, P. I. Rigney, *Irish Rosary,* March; Scotland and the Faith, II, C. J. Mackie, *Catholic Gazette,* March; L'Eglise et l'Oeuvre de l'Enseignement, Joseph Ferland, *Canada Français,* February; What Led to Canossa, Eleanor K. E. Gibbs, *Thought,* March; St. Gregory and the Lombard Queen, Julia C. Altrocchi, *ibid.*; How Religious Liberty was Won, Frederick J. Zwierlein, *ibid.*; How Politics has Injured Religion in France, Alphonse Lugan, *Dublin Review,* January; Catholic Emancipation and Its Causes, J. F. O'Doherty, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* January; Discovery of New Mexico by Fray Marcos of Nizza, A. F. Bandelier, *New Mexico Historical Review,* January; St. Francis Barracks, St. Augustine: the Franciscans in Florida, Abbot C. H. Mohr, O. S. B., *Florida Historical Society Quarterly,* January.

The *Catholic Historical Review* welcomes the appearance of *The American Nation* by Doctor Richard J. Purcell, associate professor of history in the Catholic University of America and the Catholic Sisters' College, which Ginn and Company has just published. This volume is intended as a text-book in American history for Catholic high schools and academies, but in addition should be a serviceable book in the library of teachers and general readers who are interested in an honest, terse, and candid summary of the development of the American people. As the foreword by Msgr. James H. Ryan, rector of

the Catholic University of America, points out: "The methods of the new school of historical research have been followed, as well as the recent literature on the subject of American history. There is a refreshingly modern viewpoint in this pioneer study. While the usual factual information found in standardized histories of high-school size is not neglected, the author stresses the interpretation and co-ordination of facts. He describes America in terms of movements. He portrays the life of the nation in a broad way. He has not written in a conventional and colorless style. The political and military phases of our national development are not overlooked, but emphasis is placed, as it should be, upon social and economic factors, on political parties, the growth of the Constitution, diplomatic relations, reform movements, westward expansion, the influence of the frontier, the contribution of immigrant peoples, the rise of religious toleration, the slow growth of democracy, Pan-American relations, the industrial development, and the organization of labor. It should not only inform but inspire the reader with patriotism based upon a true appreciation of the United States in its gradual evolution from primitive Jamestown to the first place among the powers of the world." While this book does not suggest any separatist point of view, it quite naturally emphasizes the rise and development of the Catholic Church in America. One sees the work of the explorers, the missionaries, the Spanish and French settlements, the Maryland experiment, the position of Catholics in colonial life, the participation of Catholics in the American Revolution, the coming of the immigrant peoples, the organization of the Church and its growth by decades in numbers and in service, the foundation of Catholic schools and colleges, the contributions in war and in peace of individual Catholics, and the nativist movements which once attracted the best Protestants but which today are condemned by the broad-minded and intelligent Protestants who are heartily ashamed of the bigotry of their backward brethren. All this material is woven into the story of this excellent text-book.